### 2AC Phobia

#### Breaking Islamophobia down into Islam and phobia is a counterproductive semantic move which reifies Ableism

Sayyid 8 (Reader in Postcolonial and Racism Studies at the University of Leeds, and Director of the Centre of Ethnicity and Racism Studies. THINKING THRU’ ISLAMOPHOBIA Symposium Papers, ARE UNICORNS MUSLIM? Centre for Ethnicity & Racism Studies, May 2008, p.1-2)

Those who see Islamophobia not as a polemical but as an analytical term are confronted with the paucity of its current formulation. Neither consitently defined, deployed, or understood, Islamophobia comes off as a nebulous and perpetually contested category. This has allowed it to circulate widely, but ineffectively: useful, for some, to vent grievances; used, by others, to pontificate; conveniently toothless platitudes and sound bites for canvassing politicians and opinion makers unable or unwilling to see its value as a tool for justice. Questions about what Islamophobia is, often (and not unreasonably in the practical domain of public policy and everyday life) slip into questions about who exactly is and is not Islamophobic. This type of question in turn slides into others that inquire whether Islamophobia actually exists, which in turn impinges upon what, if any, relationship is there between Islamophobia and racism, or Islamophobia and Orientalism. What, in short, do we gain, and lose, by talking about Islamophobia rather than racism or Orientalism? Confronted with the whirlpool of polemics and emotions around the concept, there is a strong temptation to clear the decks, mistaking essential contestion for semantic ambiguity and thus to offer rigorous and nuanced definition by way of solution. The most common such approach, which further mistakes the etymology of the concept for conceptual definition, is to try and understand Islamophobia by breaking it down into its constituent parts: we know what Islam is, and we know what phobia means, thus we can understand Islamophobia as fear of Islam (and its cognates). While not devoid of heuristic value this approach does not help us to account for the range of phenomena marshalled by and mobilisations around references to Islamophobia

#### 1. The K is an irrelevant language game that detracts from solutions to anti-Muslim oppression. Context matters and our use of ‘Islamophobia’ is justified.

Sayyid 8 (Reader in Postcolonial and Racism Studies at the University of Leeds, and Director of the Centre of Ethnicity and Racism Studies. THINKING THRU’ ISLAMOPHOBIA Symposium Papers, ARE UNICORNS MUSLIM? Centre for Ethnicity & Racism Studies, May 2008

There is an epistolary short story by Woody Allen about a game of postal chess which culminates with both players simultaneously declaring checkmate (1966:26). This simultaneous declaration is the product of an increasingly acrimonious correspondence, in which the two protagonists reel off chess moves without any serious consideration given to what the other player said his move was; the crescendo is reached when it becomes apparent that the two chess boards no longer match a single chess game, but rather that there are two games being played out under the illusion by both players that they are in fact playing the same game. This short story seems to me to capture something of the form of the debate generated by the formation and circulation of the concept of Islamophobia. Islamophobia has entered into the general field of discursivity as an essentially contested concept‘. It cannot establish an isomorphic relationship between itself and the phenomenon that it is supposed to marshal, and there seems to be a degree of confusion as to what kinds of experiences Islamophobia is supposed to delimit. Are the various security measures passed in the wake of the ̳war on terror‘ Islamophobic? Would the American gulag be as much a signifier of Islamophobia as various discriminatory practices outlined in the original Runnymede report? At the same time there are vigorous attempts to discredit Islamophobia as an act of shameless appeasement to some of the most reactionary forces in the contemporary world. It would seem that most protagonists of Islamophobia assume that they are playing the same language game when in fact a number of distinct language games are being played. This partly accounts for the relatively rapid circulation of the category. What this proliferation of language games leaves uncertain is what work the concept of Islamophobia is actually doing. It is in order to address this question that I want to consider the relationship between unicorns and being Muslim. What follows is an ontological interpretation of Muslimness and the being of unicorns; this requires abandoning the primacy of ontic studies that posit an essence that underpins (and predetermines) any subsequent investigation (Thomson, 2007). Before I can articulate this interpretation, it is important to deal with a number of common objections to the category of Islamophobia. Too much energy is spent in trying to use etymological discussion of Islamophobia as a means of discovering its true kernel. It is argued that it is not ̳Islam‘ per se which is the target of discriminatory practices but Muslims, and that by using the term ̳Islamophobia‘ in the effort to protect Muslims we have conceded a cover that prevents legitimate and necessary condemnation of many unsavoury Islamic practices. This set of arguments rests upon making a sharp distinction between ̳race‘ and religion – a distinction that is often inflected through discussions about the cultural and biological forms of racism. And upon the generalized assumption that ̳racial‘ identity is a matter of fate while religious identification is a matter of will. It can be shown without too much difficulty that so-called ̳cultural‘ and ̳biological‘ racisms are not as distinct as is often presented. ̳Races‘ were never entirely biologically determined but rather socially and politically produced. Bodies were marked simultanenously as religion, culture, history, and territories. These markings were used to group socially fabricated distinctions between Europeaness and non- Europeaness. The critique of Islam takes place as the source of ̳extreme‘ Muslim behaviour, rather than in nuances of theological disputation. In other words, Islam is implicated not because it is a ̳religion‘ but because it is seen as accounting for the behaviour of Muslims. Attempts to separate Muslims as bearers of discriminatory practices, from Islam as legitimate object of criticism, fail to take into account that this critique takes place in the context of the regulation of Muslims and the patrolling of the hierarchy between Europeaness and non Europeaness. As for the difference between will and fate this has already been forcefully dealt with and there is no need to rehearse those arguments again (see Modood, 2007). There is, however, a general point that the meaning of a term is a matter of its use rather than the application of an etymological rule. For the same reason that anti- Semitism has come to denote not exclusionary practices against all Semitic language speakers as such, but specifically against those of Jewish heritage, Islamophobia‘s meaning cannot be reduced to an etymological essence. Islamophobia‘s inexactitude is not necessarily a sign of its conceptual weakness, but a recognition of its overdetermined nature and the contested terrain it has to operate in. If Islamophobia cannot be set aside because of its difficulty of terminological framing, can it be dismissed on the grounds that categories like racism and Orientalism, already do the work that Islamophobia is supposed to do? What is it that is distinctive about Islamophobia that allows it to operate as an independent concept? There is a strong temptation by many well meaning Muslims to locate Islamophobia transhistorically, to see in every moment of Islamicate history where Muslims are marginalized or excluded as instance of Islamophobia. The first Islamophobes would be found among the Meccan aristocracy who opposed the Prophet making life for him and his early followers so unbearable that they had to leave Mecca. Such an interpretation of Islamophobia (similar to perennialist accounts of anti-Semitism which see its as the ̳longest hatred‘ and include all actions taken against those who are retrospectively and often unproblematically described as Jews, including those initiated by Egyptians, Babylonians, Selucids, Romans...) fail to pay due attention to the very different contexts in which antagonism to Islam and Muslims emerge. The distinctivness of Islamophobia has to be related to the contemporary developments in the world. Islamophobia relates to the presence of Muslims qua Muslims in the contemporary world. As such it is structured by a postcolonial and post-Caliphate logic. The postcolonial logic raises doubts about the future of the world as being decipherable as an upscale version of Western history. The narrative of ̳Plato-to-NATO‘ that underwrites the destiny of the West seems to be interrupted and its ignoble beginnings exposed in relation to an Islamicate counter-narrative. This Islamicate counter-narrative takes its bearing from the post-Caliphate universe in which demands for justice in Muslimistan (and subsequently the entire Ummah) take forms in which moments of the institutionalization of the social become contested. The conflict between Kemalists and Islamists generates an ever-widening calling of Muslims as Muslims, and the recruitment into the ranks of Islamicate counter- narrators of an ever growing number of elements and demands. At the heart of Islamophobia is not the prevalence of ̳closed‘ rather than ̳open‘ views of Islam but rather the maintenance of the ̳violent hierarchy‘ between the idea of the West (and all that it can be articulated to represent) and Islam (and all that it can be articulated to represent). This colonial hierarchy has many homologies with the hierarchy that constitutes racism itself, that is, the difference between Europeanesss (note not Europeans per se) and Non-Europeaness (Hesse, 2007). The emergence of Islamophobia can be understood as a response to attempts to erode the West and Non- West framework. As such, Islamophobia manifests itself in a variety of debates: multiculturalism, national and international security, literature, feminism... Despite the multiple sites of enunciation (and contestation) of Islamophobia, there has been little work done on Islamophobia in relationship to unicorns. It is this lacuna that I wish to address in the remaining section of this paper. There is, of course, a sense in which Muslims living in the time of the war on terror and unicorns face many similar challenges, as I hope to show, and therefore a number of insights can be gained by answering the question whether unicorns are Muslim. The answer that I wish to outline, however, is not theological. Thus an argument that all God‘s creatures submit to God and therefore they are Muslims will not be elaborated here (there is also the complication that unicorns represent not creation but rather sub- creation). Rather I want to reverse the question and proceed from there. Before I do that, however, I think it is important to say a few things about the ontological status of Muslims. It is often argued that being a Muslim is one of potentially many forms of identification that an individual may take up (to what extent that ̳take-up‘ is a matter of will or fate as we have seen is open to dispute). It is further argued that the focus on Muslim identity erases the diversity within Muslim communities. Thus, an assertion of Muslim identification often elicits the response that this is a homogenizing and totalizing label which privileges one identity option or subject position over others. It also privileges a religious form of identification over other potentially more meaningful subject positions such as those offered by gender, class, nationality,... Muslim identifications are considered to be superficial because they are ̳religious‘. This denial of Muslims as meaningful category is not simply an epistemological exercise or academic enterprise, though it takes the form of such mere intellectual pursuits, but rather involves forging a framework which systematically excludes and violates Muslim agency. The polemical nature of the argument is often disavowed by deployment of a form of sociological reasoning which presents itself simply as the description of the world as it is. The difficulty, however, is not necessarily with Muslim identities but rather with conventional wisdom‘s inability to understand the nature of political identity. Political identities are central to any form of politics. These political identities can in principle be constructed around any set of social demands. The mobilization of Muslims as Muslims is an ersatz form of mobilization, and Muslim identity is no less authentic than other forms of political identification. This belief that Muslims are like unicorns, fictive creatures to be found in myths and symbols but otherwise absent from the world, this refusal to acknowledge Muslim identity as being a proper form of political identification, is perhaps one of the hallmarks of Islamophobia. As for the question of whether unicorns are Muslim, going on what has been discussed above the answer can only be.

#### 2. Using the term increases public awareness and legal solutions to oppression – rejecting our discourse cedes the terms of the debate to right-wing racists.

Esposito 11 - John L. is a University Professor, Professor of Religion and International Affairs and of Islamic Studies and Founding Director of the Prince Alwaleed bin Talal Center for Muslim-Christian Understanding at the Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University. Islamophobia and the Challenges of Pluralism in the 21st Century, Oxford University Press, pg. 88)

We live in a world in which two great world religions with Semitic origins are often under siege, the objects of discrimination, hate crimes, and acts of violence and terror. For one, the 14-18 million Jews of the world, we have a powerful term, anti-Semitism, and a global awareness and sensitivity that can be mobilized against anti-Semitic attitudes and acts. As history and recent experiences affirm, the term anti-Semitism is a key antidote for this disease that continues to infect our societies. However, for the 1.3 billion Muslims in the world, we have had no comparable effective way to counter the hostility, prejudice and discrimination directed towards Islam and Muslims. In 1997, the Runnymede Trust, a UK-based independent think tank on ethnicity and cultural diversity, coined the term ‘Islamophobia,’ to describe what they saw as a two-stranded form of racism – rooted in both the ‘different’ physical appearance of Muslims and also in an intolerance of their religious and cultural beliefs. At a December 7, 2004 UN conference, “Confronting Islamophobia: Education for Tolerance and Understanding,” Kofi Annan addressed the international scope of its impact: “[when] the world is compelled to coin a new term to take account of increasingly widespread bigotry – that it is a sad and troubling development. Such is the case with ‘Islamophobia’.... Since the September 11 attacks on the United States, many Muslims, particularly in the West, have found themselves the objects of suspicion, harassment and discrimination.... Too many people see Islam as a monolith and as intrinsically opposed to the West... [The] Caricature remains widespread and the gulf of ignorance is dangerously deep.”1 How Serious is the Problem? While the term Islamophobia has been used quite regularly in Europe, in America it has not yet gained wide recognition. Due to the lack of a collective consciousness regarding the reality of ‘Islamophobia’ in the U.S., political and reli- gious leaders and media commentators engage in a form of hate speech, asserting with impunity what would never appear in mainstream broadcast or print media about Jews, Christians and established ethnic and racial groups in America. For example, Ann Coulter, author and syndicated columnist, commented: “We should invade their countries, kill their leaders and convert them to Christianity. We weren’t punctilious about locating and punishing only Hitler and his top officers. We carpet-bombed German cities; we killed civilians. That’s war. And this is war.”2 Michael Savage, host of the The Savage Nation, stated: “I tell you right now - the largest percentage of Americans would like to see a nuclear weapon dropped on a major Arab capital. They don’t even care which one...I think these people need to be forcibly converted to Christianity. It’s the only thing that can probably turn them into human beings.”3 Rush Limbaugh, reacting to criticism of the abuse of Iraqi prisoners at Abu Graeb, commented, “They’re the ones who are sick. They’re the ones who are per- verted. They are the ones who are dangerous. They are the ones who are subhu- man. They are the ones who are human debris, not the United States of America and not our soldiers and not our prison guards.”4 David Horowitz, editor of Frontpage and sponsor of Jihad Watch summa- rizes the views of many Islam/Muslim bashers: “Liberals are so afraid of offend- ing Muslims that they are denying these facts which are staring us in the face: • Muslims the world over are engaged in an openly declared Holy War or Jihad against the West. • This Jihad is a grave danger to our nation and to all of Western civilization. • The Jihad challenges every facet of American life. Its agenda includes the purposeful and systematic dismantling of all aspects of our culture. It hopes ultimately to impose Sharia law on the U.S., replacing our law with provi- sions such as the stoning of adulterous women and cutting off thieves’ hands. • The extent of the threat is not being effectively and truthfully communi- cated to the American public.5 Leading figures of the Christian Right were not to be outdone. Despite President George W. Bush’s careful distinction between the religion of Islam and the acts of a minority of extremists, religious leaders who are counted among President Bush’s closest political allies engaged in a demonization of Islam that fostered religious bigotry and anti-Muslim demagoguery. On PBS’s Religion & Ethics, Franklin Graham stated, “The God of Islam is not the same God of the Christian or the Judeo-Christian faith. It is a different God, and I believe a very evil and a very wicked religion.”6 On Fox News’ Hannity & Colmes, Pat Robertson said, “This man [Muhammad] was an absolute wild-eyed fanatic. He was a robber and a brigand. And to say that these terrorists distort Islam, they’re carrying out Islam...I mean, this man was a killer. And to think that this is a peaceful religion is fraudulent.”7 Robertson also called Islam “a monumental scam” and claimed the Quran, Islam’s revealed text, “is strictly a theft of Jewish theology.” Jerry Falwell referred to the Prophet Muhammad as a “terrorist” on the CBS news program “60 Minutes.” At a pro-Israel rally, Benny Hinn declared, “This is not a war between Arabs and Jews. It’s between God and the devil.” 8

### 2AC Idaho State

#### Permutation: Endorse an anti-subordinationist praxis centered on challenging islamophobic indefinite detention policies and an unflinching paradigmatic analysis

#### The affirmative’s challenge to islamophobic indefinite detention policies creates an ideal intersectional space to build coalitions against racial violence—general claims to racial injustice are insufficient—we must coalesce around particular projects where there is a commonality of interest LIKE THE ADVOCACY—Coalitions our net better despite their indicts

Wing 3, Bessie Dutton Murray Distinguished Professor of Law

[Spring 2003, Adrien Katherine Wing is a Bessie Dutton Murray Distinguished Professor of Law at the University of Iowa College of Law. A.B. Princeton, 1978; M.A. UCLA, 1979; J.D. Stanford, 1982. This paper was presented at the Civil Rights symposium of the Louisiana State“Civil Rights in the Post 911 World: Critical Race Praxis, Coalition Building, and the War on Terrorism”, <http://digitalcommons.law.lsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=5987&context=lalrev&sei-redir=1&referer=http%3A%2F%2Fscholar.google.com%2Fscholar%3Fq%3Dguantanamo%2B%2522critical%2Brace%2Btheory%2522%26btnG%3D%26hl%3Den%26as_sdt%3D0%252C5%26as_vis%3D1#search=%22guantanamo%20critical%20race%20theory%22>, 63 La. L. Rev. (2003)]

Because of the various problems with coalition building, several scholars do not endorse it. For example, Delgado advocates laboring within your own group for the social justice goals you support. "For some projects, justice turns out to be a solitary though heroic quest, and the road to justice is one that must be traveled alone, or with our deepest, most trusted companions."' 4 Haunani-Kay Trask states that real organizing of native Hawaiians takes place outside of coalitions.205 She supports Malcolm X's claims that whites need to tackle racism within their own communities, rather than in coalition." "Work in conjunction with us-each working among our own kind."207 Despite the frictions and problems between various traditional and nontraditional groups, coalition building can be a useful tool of critical race praxis in the current period. African Americans have been used to being the dominant minority in the United States, able to keep their concerns at the center of the civil rights movement. Latinos are now surpassing Blacks numerically,208 and are the majority in California already.2 They will be 25% of the U.S. population by 2050.210 Blacks will have to learn to work in coalition with Latinos to ensure that Black concerns are not lost in a new dispensation of "favored minority." While the Latinos are becoming the majority minority, they are not as politically organized as the Blacks yet, with many being recent immigrants or noncitizens, who may not speak English.21 ' Thus in some instances, Latinos will need to learn from African Americans, and with them, to achieve various goals. Coalition is good for Asians because although they score higher on standardized tests and have a higher income level than the other minority groups, history has already shown that they remain regarded as perpetual foreigners,1 2 once subject to internment. 3 Native Americans constitute only two million people," 4 and can benefit from linking with the larger groups, some of whom may resent those tribes, who now profit from gambling casino wealth." 5 Arabs and Muslims need to join in coalition with the other groups because they are too small and too recent as immigrants in comparison to the other groups to go it alone. As the current personification of evil of the moment, they need to draw upon the resources of other groups for support. Coalition building does not happen in a vacuum. It must coalesce around particular projects where there is commonality of interest. For instance, Frank Valdes has noted that Latinos and Asians share a common interest in legal issues that involve "immigration, family, citizenship, nationhood, language, expression, culture, and global economic restructuring."216 Racial profiling is a potential issue for cooperation as it affects all the major minority groups. I will use it for illustrative purposes in the remainder of this section, even though it is only one of various issues that could be the basis for coalition building. Asian scholars have noted how both the recent mistreatment of Chinese American scientist Dr. Wen Ho Lee 2 17 and the interning of 120,000 Japanese and Japanese Americans in World War II could both be regarded as cases of racial profiling.218 Kevin Johnson has called for Asians and Latinos to form political coalitions to challenge arbitrary INS conduct . 21 He also wants Blacks and Latinos to form coalitions to work on issues of racial profiling, as well.22° In the war against terrorism, racial profiling is particularly affecting Blacks, Latinos and South Asians who look Arab, creating an ideal intersectional issue for coalition building.22 ' Coalescing around profiling in these times will not be easy. In his timely book, Justice at War: Civil Liberties and Civil Rights in a Time of Crisis, Richard Delgado, a founder of CRT, queries, "Will the establishment insist on Americanism and toeing the line in the war on terrorism, and demand that minorities demonstrate loyalty, in return for a symbolic concession or two?.. .Will it choose one minority group for favored treatment, in hope of keeping the others in line."2'22 There are several foreseeable scenarios in this regard. For example, the Bush administration could reconfigure rather than terminate various federal affirmative action programs after an expected hostile Supreme Court decision in the upcoming Michigan cases,223 to attempt to ensure Black support for the war efforts. The administration's rejection of the pro-affirmative action position of the University of Michigan may have attracted some Asian support.224 The perpetuation of the forty year old blockade against Cuba despite U.S. business opposition ensures Cuban American loyalty,225 and the rumored appointment of a Hispanic for the next U.S. Supreme Court vacancy may attract other Latinos.22 ' Delgado wonders whether people of color will "be able to work together toward mutual goals--or [will] the current factionalism and distrust continue into the future, with various minority groups competing for crumbs while majoritarian rule continue[s] unabated? 22

#### To claim that domestic racism should proceed the “international” violence the US commits against foreign bodies is unethical—their overly broad focus on white supremacy cannot explain particulars of interethnic conflicts and undermines effective racial politics

Sunstrom 8, Associate Professor of Philosophy

[2008, Ronald R. Sunstrom is a black Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of San Francisco; additionally, he teaches for USF's African American Studies program and the Master of Public Affairs program for the Leo T. McCarthy Center of Public Service and the Common Good. He was awarded the 2008 Sankofa Faculty Award from USF's Multicultural Student Services, USF's 2009 Ignatian Service Award, and was a co-winner of the 2010 USF Distinguished Teaching Award. His areas of research include political theory, critical social and race theory, and African American and Asian American philosophy, “The Browning of America and the Evasion of Social Justice”, pp. 65-92]

It would be odd and troubling for the nation to merrily work toward justice at “home,” all the while neglecting the demands of those whom the nation regarded as perpetual foreigners (and not really being at “home” in the nation) and the demands of global justice. Such a vision of justice is self-serving and morally hollow. Long-existing civil rights claims should not delimit the nation’s moral boundaries and its conception of civil rights, thus ipso facto severing them from internationally determined human rights. The reactions of some citizens to the browning of America, unfortunately, open up this possibility, which is yet another evasion of social justice.7 When I broach these issues, or any of the particular issues discussed in this book, the response I frequently receive is that these issues are red herrings that divert our attention away from the real enemy, that of white supremacy.8 I am dubious about this complaint; after all, focusing on “white supremacy” does not directly address the particulars of the interethnic confl icts that arise from the browning of America. Perhaps, though, these critics mean that we should focus on how “white supremacy,” in the form of institutionalized racism or white power, divides minority groups, so as to conquer them and leave them to fi ght over a limited set of resources. Alternatively, these critiques would have us focus on how Latinos, Asian Americans, Americans who identify as multiracial, and immigrants adopt anti-black racism and the privileges of whiteness as they assimilate into American society. I think the latter argument is bogus, and chapter 3 is devoted in part to explaining why. As for the former, I think “white supremacy” is too broad and vague a category to be helpful, and that focusing on such a fl awed category of power can be positively harmful. Such moves simply sidestep the particular issues that are raised in interethnic confl icts and may even contribute to the evasions I outlined earlier. The people of the United States, as they experience and participate in the browning of America, should resist both types of evasions. The Browning of America and the Evasion of Social Justice argues, in contrast, that the people of the United States should see in its demographic change the transformation of social justice. They should welcome that transformation and view it as an opportunity to satisfy old debts and expand in a cosmopolitan direction the very idea of social justice.

#### Islamophobia presents a challenge to our status quo understandings of race— the US has launched a civilizational and cultural war on Islam—racism has moved beyond exclusions justified on biological difference to a new differentialist racism based on culture

Semati 10, Assistant Professor of Communication

[2010, Mehdi Semati is an Assistant Professor of Communication at Eastern Illinois University. He teaches classes in Communication, International communication, and Media Studies and production. His research addresses culture and global communication., “ISLAMOPHOBIA, CULTURE AND RACE IN THE AGE OF EMPIRE”, Cultural studies, Volume 24, Issue 2]

In this context, addressing racial formation in terms of racial projects at the macro level of social processes, we may point to judicial, legislative, and administrative initiatives by the state. The infamous words of President Bush in 2001, ‘Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists,’ which neatly recuperates the bipolar structure of the Cold War, (re)constitutes the us/them structure. The executive and legislative measures that have followed these initiatives ‘have included mass arrests, secret and indefinite detentions, prolonged detention of “material witnesses,” closed hearings and use of secret evidence, government eavesdropping on attorney-client conversations, FBI home and work visits, wiretapping, seizures of property, removals of aliens with technical visa violations, and mandatory special registration.’ As a result, as of 2004, ‘at least 100,000 Arabs and Muslims living in the United States have personally experienced one of these measures.’18 At the micro-social level, to follow the racial formation argument, we might say that the state of being ‘spooked’ and the ability to ‘see’ suspicious brown men (in this or similar cases) who ‘look’ a particular way is a way of experiencing racialization. In Omi and Winant's (1994) language, ‘our ability to interpret racial meanings depends on the preconceived notions of a racialized social structure’ (p. 59). The color-coded terrorism threat advisory scale by the Homeland Security Advisory System, and its politicized deployment by the Bush administration, is where the social structure and the individual psychic meet. Here these projects, against the backdrop of relentless cultural representations of Muslim Other, entail the construction and intensification of the generic category of ‘Arab-Middle Eastern-Muslim’ Other (see Naber 2006, Volpp 2003). In this hyphenated space we find the work of racialization of the Other through racializing religion, national origins, ethnicity, phenotypes (‘brown’ skin) and their intersections. As Naber (2006) has argued, ‘within the post-9/11 moment of crisis, the racialization of an “Arab-Middle Eastern-Muslim” Other has been constituted by a dual process of cultural racism and the racialization of national origin’ (p. 236). Cultural racism builds on a conceptualization of ‘race as culture,’ which in Goldberg's (1993) analysis includes religion, language, and dress among others. Is there a shift in the forms and strategies of racism that corresponds to this shift from race as biology to race as culture? The passage from imperialism to Empire is reflected in the shifting configurations of racism (Hardt & Negri 2000). There is a shift in the dominant theoretical form of racism. Racist theory based on biology (modern racism) is replaced by one based on culture (imperial racism). Imperialist racist theory agrees with the thrust of modern anti-racism in that ‘race’ is a social construction, that individual behavior or aptitude cannot be attributed to biological origins. Instead, they are the product of different cultures. Up to this point, Hardt amd Negri (2000) argue, imperial racism and modern anti-racism are taking the same position (p. 192). Here they draw from Balibar (1991) and his discussion of ‘neo-racism.’ Balibar argues that the ‘new’ racism is ‘racism without races.’ The neo-racist takes into account the failure of the classical racism, which viewed the Other inferior according to ‘race’ based on biological differences. In the ‘neo-racist’ logic, the Other/self dichotomy is no longer explained in an inferior/superior framework. Instead, the Other is believed to be ‘different.’ This is the racism of ‘the era of “decolonization,” of the reversal of the population movements between the old colonies and the old metropolises, and the division of the humanities within a single political space’ (p. 21). Here culture functions ‘like a nature, and it can in particular function as a way of locking individuals and groups a priori into a genealogy, into a determination that is immutable and intangible in origin’ (p. 22). The dominant theme for this racism ‘is the insurmountablity of cultural differences, a racism which, at first sight, does not postulate the superiority of certain groups or peoples in relation to others but “only” the harmfulness of abolishing frontiers, the incompatibility of life-styles and traditions’ (p. 21). Here Balibar characterizes neo-racism as ‘culturalist’ or ‘differentialist’ racism.19 It is not surprising that prominent individuals have characterized many of the current geopolitical conflicts as religious/cultural/civilizational. Influential religious leaders (e.g. Jerry Falwell, Par Robertson, Franklin Graham), active military personnel (e.g. General Boykin), Congressmen (e.g. Tom Delay, Peter king, Conrad Burns), and media personalities with megaphones (e.g. Glenn Beck, Bill O'Rilley, Ann Coulter, Michael Savage) are among them.20 President George W. Bush's ‘offhand’ remarks in September of 2001 that ‘the war on terror’ was a ‘crusade,’ a remark that made ‘Europe cringe,’21 was among the first to signal such a view. This conceptualization of ‘difference,’ of ‘other’ cultures as immutable, fixed, frozen and static essences, is as essentialist as the biological one. The hatful diatribe and slurs against Muslims (e.g. ‘ragheads,’ ‘diaperheads,’ ‘sand niggers,’ ‘hajis’) and the more respectful version of ‘they are different’ and ‘we can't mix’ amount to the same difference. Although culture is used as a substitute for race, paradoxically, its function is to preserve ‘racial difference’ and to strengthen the extant racial hegemonies. The right-wing diatribe against ‘towel-heads’ and the multicultural sensibility that mystifies international politics and political violence by attributing them to differences in culture, tradition, and religion are both informed by the logic of differentialist racism. Thus, Islamophobia should be understood in these terms. Islamophobia is a cultural-ideological outlook that seeks to explain ills of the (global) social order by attributing them to Islam. It is a way of thinking that conflates histories, politics, societies and cultures of the Middle East into a single unified and negative conception of Islam. It is an ideology in which the ‘backwardness’ of the Other is established through an essentialized Islam. It is, as a form of racism, an essentialist view of peoples whose culture it deems ‘different’ in an eternal, fixed, and immutable fashion. It is a way of conceptualizing (international) politics that explains political acts and political violence not in terms of geopolitical calculations, motives, and actors, but in terms of religion. Islamophobia posits ‘Islam’ as a conception of the world that is incompatible with modernity, with civilization, and, more important, with Euro-Americanness. Islamophobia, on the one hand, creates difference (the ‘Other’) and, on the other hand, erases difference (all of ‘them’ are the ‘same’).

#### We must question traditional anti-racism strategies when faced with this new form of exclusion grounded in xenophobia and citizenship

Traditional anti-racism finds itself ATTACKED from the rear, turned against itself, as culture functioning as nature, naturalizing human behavior and social affinities, our TRUE natural milieu, has proven a DEFENSIVE against the ABOLITION of difference played out in interethnic conflicts and a general rise in AGGRESSIVENESS, dangerous reactions become NATURAL. We are moving towards a theory of RACE RELATIONS which naturalizes not racial belonging but racist conduct.

This is DIFFERENTIALIST RACISM, a metaracism, a second-position racism drawn from the lessons of the conflict between racism and anti-racism that teaches the maintenance of cultural DISTANCES gives rise to the claims of REVERSE DISCRIMINATION. Theories of differentialist racism connect with crowd psychology that serve as a GENERAL EXPLANATION of irrational movements, aggression and collective violence, XENAPHOBIA. The neo-racist ideologues are the REALIST technicians of social psychology.

Balibar 5, Professor of Philosophy
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To emphasize the importance of the question, we must first of all bring out the political consequences of this change. The first is a destabilization of the defences of traditional anti-racism in so far as its argumentation finds itself attacked from the rear, if not indeed turned against itself (what Taguieff excellently terms the 'turn-about effect' of differentialist racism). It is granted from the outset that races do not constitute isolable biological units and that in reality there are no 'human races'. It may also be admitted that the behaviour of individuals and their 'aptitudes' cannot be explained in terms of their blood or even their genes, but are the result of their belonging to historical 'cultures'. Now anthropological culturalism, which is entirely orientated towards the recognition of the diversity and equality of cultures with only the polyphonic ensemble constituting human civilization - and also their transhistorical permanence, had provided the humanist and cosmopolitan anti-racism of the post-war period with most of its arguments. Its value had been confirmed by the contribution it made to the struggle against the hegemony of certain standardizing imperialisms and against the elimination of minority or dominated civilizations - 'ethnocide'. Differentialist racism takes this argumentation at its word. One of the great figures in anthropology, Claude Levi-Strauss, who not so long ago distinguished himself by demonstrating that all civilizations are equally complex and necessary for the progression of human thought, now in 'Race and Culture' finds himself enrolled, whether he likes it or not, in the service of the idea that the 'mixing of cultures' and the suppression of 'cultural distances' would correspond to the intellectual death of humanity and would perhaps even endanger the control mechanisms that ensure its biological survival. And this 'demonstration' is immediately related to the 'spontaneous' tendency of human groups (in practice national groups, though the anthropological significance of the political category of nation is obviously rather dubious) to preserve their traditions, and thus their identity. What we see here is that biological or genetic naturalism is not the only means of naturalizing human behaviour and social affinities. At the cost of abandoning the hierarchical model (though the abandonment is more apparent than real, as we shall see), culture can also function like a nature, and it can in particular function as a way of locking individuals and groups a priori into a genealogy, into a determination that is immutable and intangible in origin. But this first turn-about effect gives rise to a second, which turns matters about even more and is, for that, all the more effective: if insurmountable cultural difference is our true 'natural milieu', the atmosphere indispensable to us if we are to breathe the air of history, then the abolition of that difference will necessarily give rise to defensive reactions, 'interethnic' conflicts and a general rise in aggressiveness. Such reactions, we are told, are 'natural', but they are also dangerous. By an astonishing volte-face, we here see the difterentialist doctrines themselves proposing to explain racism (and to ward it off). In fact, what we see is a general displacement of the problematic. We now move from the theory of races or the struggle between the races in human history, whether based on biological or psychological principles, to a theory of 'race relations' within society, which naturalizes not racial belonging but racist conduct. From the logical point of view, differentialist racism is a meta-racism, or what we might call a 'second-position' racism, which presents itself as having drawn the lessons from the conflict between racism and anti-racism, as a politically operational theory of the causes of social aggression. If you want to avoid racism, you have to avoid that 'abstract' anti-racism which fails to grasp the psychological and sociological laws of human population movements; you have to respect the 'tolerance thresholds', maintain 'cultural distances' or, in other words, in accordance with the postulate that individuals are the exclusive heirs and bearers of a single culture, segregate collectivities (the best barrier in this regard still being national frontiers). And here we leave the realm of speculation to enter directly upon political terrain and the interpretation of everyday experience. Naturally, 'abstract' is not an epistemological category, but a value judgement which is the more eagerly applied when the practices to which it corresponds are the more concrete or effective: programmes of urban renewal, anti-discrimination struggles, including even positive discrimination in schooling and jobs (what the American New Right calls 'reverse discrimination'; in France too we are more and more often hearing 'reasonable' figures who have no connection with any extremist movements explaining that 'it is anti-racism which creates racism' by its agitation and its manner of 'provoking' the mass of the citizenry's national sentiments). It is not by chance that the theories of differentialist racism (which from now on will tend to present itself as the true anti-racism and therefore the true humanism) here connect easily with 'crowd psychology', which is enjoying something of a revival, as a general explanation of irrational movements, aggression and collective violence, and, particularly, of xenophobia, We can see here the double game mentioned above operating fully: the masses are presented with an explanation of their own 'spontaneity' and at the same time they are implicitly disparaged as a 'primitive' crowd. The neo-racist ideologues are not mystical heredity theorists, but 'realist' technicians of social psychology.

#### Academic discussions of critical race theory have not adjusted to the new reality—critical discussions of race in the United States have left out the role of the war on terror—traditional focus on the struggle of Blacks justified on the basis of slavery marginalizes discussions of racism against Brown bodies who have been socially constructed as Black—now is the time to instead solidify a more inclusive coalition building effort
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As we await the decisions in the University of Michigan affirmative action cases,' this symposium raises a timely and important query: is civil rights law dead? This article answers that query by asserting that there is a need for a thorough reconceptualization in the 21 st century. Historically, civil rights in the United States has been synonymous with the struggle of African Americans to attain racial equality with white Americans.2 The battles of other ethnic minorities, such as Latinos, Asians and Native Americans, not to mention the struggles of other victims of discrimination such as women, gays, the disabled or the aged, have often received secondary attention.' Some scholars and activists would assert that, given the unique history of Blacks as slaves in this country, the continuation of the so-called black-white binary or emphasis is still justified.4 In my view, we must expand our civil rights efforts beyond all the above mentioned groups to include those that do not easily fit into historic racial categories: specifically Arabs and Muslims, who have faced especially increased discrimination since September 11, 2001.' That day clearly changed the United States, if not the world, in very profound ways. Since then, the War on Terrorism has taken precedence in both U.S. foreign and domestic policy. In late 2001, the foreign policy aspect manifested itself as a literal war in Afghanistan that overthrew the globally despised Taliban regime.' Shortly after the symposium for which this paper was composed took place, the U.S. launched a war against Iraq to overthrow its long term leader Saddam Hussein and destroy any weapons of mass destruction.' On the domestic front, these wars have had profound effects on the civil liberties of both noncitizens and citizens, particularly Arabs, Muslims, and those who resemble them.9 Part 11 of this article details how the civil rights of Arabs and Muslims have been restricted both before and after September 11, 2001.10 Using a Critical Race Theory (CRT)" analysis, we shall see how these groups have been socially constructed as "Black," with the negative legal connotations historically attributed to that designation. For example, racial profiling, which originated as a term synonymous with Blacks and police traffic stops, 2 now equally applies to both Arabs and Muslims in many contexts. Part HI draws upon CRT for answers for how to solidify a new, more inclusive civil rights movement. 3 Critical Race Praxis, combining theory and practice, will be detailed as a means to create solutions to the civil rights dilemmas facing all groups, including Arabs and Muslims. Part IV suggests a specific form of praxis, coalition building, as a problematic but appropriate means for the new and old components of the civil rights movement to intersect and perhaps join forces from time to time.'4 Part V concludes with specific proposals for coalitions that may help alleviate the bleak situation currently facing Arabs and Muslims."

#### This epistemological exclusion does more than just excluding cultural forms of racism from our discussion, it actively replicates them—the view of American racism as a black/white issue helped solidify xenophobic violence against Arab bodies in the war on terror as foreign issues outside the American schema
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To underline this fi nal point, the critiques of the binary offered by legal scholars, such as Juan Perea and Richard Delgado, underscore the dangers that Alcoff’s critique exposes.34 Delgado in particular distinguishes three ways that the binary negatively affects Latinos and Asian Americans. First, it has framed the legal conception of equal protection in terms of the struggle for equal black citizenship. That frame aids in discrimination against nonwhite immigrants and undermines the equal protection of Latino/a and Asian American citizens. Second, the binary plays into contractarian justifications for the national self-determination of citizenship and thus cements past race-based (and racist) definitions of citizenship. Third, the binary places Latinos, Asian Americans, and Native Americans “out of sight” and thus out of the discourse of racial justice. The consequence of the normative force of the binary is that African Americans, according to Delgado, are trained to pursue, and are recognized as the primary legitimate recipients of, benefi ts and protections that fl ow from antidiscrimination laws. The black-white binary, as a “template” or master key, demarcates who is a proper subject of our thoughts about race, racism, and civil rights. Consequently, some individuals and groups, and their respective interests, are left out of public deliberations of race and social justice, and are typifi ed as, quite literally, foreign issues. Legal scholar Juan Perea put it this way: If Latinos/as and Asian Americans are presumed to be White by both White and Black writers . . . then our claims to justice will not be heard or acknowledged. Our claims can be ignored by Whites, since we are not Black and therefore are not subject to real racism. And our claims can be ignored by Blacks, since we are presumed to be, not Black, but becoming White, and therefore not subject to real racism. Latinos/as do not fi t the boxes supplied by the paradigm.35 In the wake of the reaction of the United States to the terrorist strikes against the World Trade Center towers, the black-white binary’s role as principle of exclusion in the service of American nationalism took on an ugly clarity.36 It assuaged American worries about racism as it targeted Arabs, Middle Easterners, and Muslims in the war against Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan, the war against Iraq, and the everlasting war on terror.37 Whatever the role of racism in the rounding up, questioning, detention, and expulsion of Arabs, Muslims, and people from the Middle East, the United States was comforted by the “United We Stand” rhetoric, and a rainbow coalition of Americans helped author and justify the United States’ reactions to terrorism. Thus practices such as the racial profi ling of Arabs, Muslims, and those who look like them, to our eyes, met with 60 percent approval ratings, while before the war 80 percent of Americans disapproved of racial profi ling, a sentiment that George Bush and even John Ashcroft supported before the war. It is of great consequence that this exclusion is a result of a particular black-white normative vision of the American nation as being properly and primarily black and white. The implication is that the black-white binary is a nativist idea that aids the continued exclusion of Latinos, Asian Americans, and other nonwhite immigrant groups, such as Arabs and Muslims, from full citizenship and equal protection.38

#### Use of the black-white binary oversimplifies diverse racial injustices and makes it easier to undervalue anti-black racism—flips the K
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This confl ation, consequently, has ill effects for African Americans. It has contributed to the common assumption that there is nothing unique about anti-black racism. The idea here is that expressions and the legacy anti-Asian or anti-Latino racism are quantitatively and qualitatively equivalent to anti-black racism. David Hollinger has named this the “one-hate rule,” and it is a deeply misguided and inaccurate assumption that has undervalued the extent, depth, and effect of anti-black racism.29 The one-hate rule has resulted in unfair, and quite malicious, comparisons of African Americans to socalled “model minorities.”30 Further, it has muddled the purpose of originally backward-looking civil rights programs conceived to rectify past racist harms against African Americans.31

#### The 1NC and Block’s argument will almost entire rely on a historical narrative of slavery—“the founding of America is tied to antiblackness and means it comes first”—even it’s factually accurate, it is not a defense of their politics—their historic analysis doesn’t respond to the complexities of Modern America which undermines effective racial politics and specifically marginalizes indigenous oppression
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The sixth form of the binary is justifi ed for some because of the historical precedence of the African American experience, as well as the relative severity of the confl ict between African Americans and whites. For others, such as Mary Frances Berry, Andrew Hacker, and Toni Morrison, the sixth form has additional justifi cation because, as Toni Morrison put it, assimilation and integration into the United States happen upon the “backs of blacks.” My objection to the fourth form of the binary (that it names prescriptive patterns of racial organization) undermines the latter claim, and without it the fi rst claim is not as signifi cant. Mainstream African American demands for justice deserve satisfaction, and those claims do not need the black-white binary as justifi cation. Worse, the black-white binary in the contemporary multiethnic United States, with the complexities of its history in which the confl ations of the black-white binary are invalid, undermines the realization of social justice for all because it, as Alcoff argued, “seriously undermines the possibility of achieving coalitions.”42 Therefore, public deliberations that commence by professions of the black-white binary are anti-political and either imperil or end public communication on race and social justice. Additionally, the basic historical claim of the sixth form of the binary is suspicious when Native American claims are considered. Native Americans possess their own history as a group defi ned as a national other and enemy of the United States. The history of Native Americans, since 1492, has been interwoven with that of the descendents of Africans brought to the Americas by European powers, but their history is distinct in terms of geography, language, culture, international political treaties, and the formation of sovereign nations within North and South America and the Caribbean. The claims of the black-white binary are so totalizing that it would erase the importance of this history by assimilating Native Americans in the black-white system. This is the reason Native Americans scholars, such as Vine Deloria and David Wilkins, need to remind Americans that Native Americans are members of “sovereign nations” and are not minorities; or, in the words of Will Kymlicka, indigenous Americans are “national minorities” rather than a “polyethnic” group.43 The black-white binary does violence to that distinction by erasing Native Americans’ claims of precedence and envisioning a state of national racial harmony that is at odds with Native American sovereignty.