

## INTRODUCTION: A SIGHTLINE

Critical Ethnic Studies Editorial Collective:

NADA ELIA, DAVID HERNÁNDEZ, JODI KIM, SHANA L. REDMOND,  
DYLAN RODRÍGUEZ, AND SARITA ECHAVEZ SEE

It is a generally well-known (and often mythified) fact that the Third World Liberation Front (TWLF) model of solidarity- and alliance-based rebellion and revolutionary struggle structured the opening stanzas of ethnic studies as a political and cultural intervention into the white supremacist university during the late 1960s and early 1970s. A peculiar pedagogical narrative has sprung forth from this period of antiracist and anti-imperialist social movements. This narrative both draws from and selectively neutralizes the principled forms of *intellectual* self-determination that constituted the TWLF as a political and cultural practice. That is, the coherence of ethnic studies as such has relied on a changing, often vexed set of rationalizations, arguments, and stories regarding the necessity and propriety of convening different epistemic-institutional formations within a political-intellectual housing (whether an academic department, high school curriculum, or community-formed project). These critical and radical intellectual projects, each with its own autonomous genealogy, have become legible as black studies, African American studies, Native American studies, indigenous studies, Chicano/a studies, Puerto Rican studies, Asian American studies, Latino/a studies, Arab American studies, women of color feminisms, queer of color critique, and so forth. Ethnic studies, as a pedagogical and narrative rubric, attempts to convene these

autonomous intellectual traditions within a shared institutional space, inciting both transformative possibilities and severe internal contradictions. The significance of the TWLF model is thus not only its historical contribution to the disruption and rearticulation of the white university but also its crystallization of an *insurgent narrative structure* that facilitates the adjoining of vastly disparate human oppressions and rebellions into an ostensible totality of shared, radical agency against empire, conquest, criminalization, and enslavement. TWLF is the recurring dream form of a colored, colonized, enslaved revolt against an oppressive white world, in which a *totality* of degraded and disfranchised peoples convene in struggle against a *totality* of humiliations, injustices, dispossessions, and dominations. How has such a political-cultural imagination enabled robust collective movements against oppressive hegemonies while also (necessarily) failing to fulfill the aspirations of a radical totality, which the TWLF often references as “unity,” “the people,” and so forth?

Perhaps the central, animating force of this narrative or dream form is its tendency to generate schematic, (implicitly) comparative, and sometimes hierarchical descriptions of epochal human (and dehumanizing) violences—from colonial displacement to chattel enslavement, racial labor exploitation to massive incarceration. This tendency simultaneously infers the irreducibility and uniqueness of such historical encounters while cohering them as a *generalized whole*, coexisting in a relative symbiosis with the irreparable brutalities of modernity and nation-building. The truth-effect of this narrative is a compartmentalization of human suffering into relatively discrete historical episodes and geographies: colonization, land displacement, chattel enslavement, wars of conquest, apartheid and segregation, physical genocide, forced labor migration, and more. In this iteration ethnic studies attempts to compose the epistemological foundations for critical activist labors that strive to make sense of a mind-numbingly oppressive global-historical totality.

What if this alleged totality of epochal violence cannot be so easily generalized into coherence nor *schematically and coterminously* apprehended? While we are not suggesting the dismissal or abolition of ethnic studies and related institutionalizations, we are not convinced that such narratives are sufficient to the ongoing task of catalyzing or sustaining insurrection against a global social order that is so clearly apocalyptic for select, targeted subjects, populations, and bodies. When the narrative schematic fails, the consequences are far graver than we are usually willing to admit.

On the one hand ethnic studies has been enfolded into the neoliberal institutional mandates of the university through a particular proliferation as

commodified and domesticated “difference” that performs the ideological and material labor of buttressing late-capitalist mantras such as “diversity and excellence” and “global citizens.” On the other hand various ethnic studies and related interdisciplinary units and programs have been rendered vulnerable and periodically threatened with eradication within a university structure that is surrendering to the twin pressures of increased corporatization and economic duress. It would seem, then, that ethnic studies is at once a necessary component of a “global” and globally competitive twenty-first-century university *and* an anachronistic holdover from 1968. What does it mean that ethnic studies has come to be so vulnerable and available to such a Janus-faced positioning and appropriation? In what manner was the TWLF’s framing of “solidarity” co-opted into a liberal politics of multiculturalism? Are there alternative intellectual and political frameworks for articulating the solidarities of ethnic studies that can speak against these liberal multiculturalist appropriations? The emerging critical ethnic studies project is a collective attempt to build on the possibilities enlivened by the historical work of ethnic studies, while also inaugurating a radical response to the appropriations of liberal multiculturalism.

### The Critical Ethnic Studies Project as Neither Even nor Owned

In the spirit of the 2011 inaugural conference of the Critical Ethnic Studies Association (CESA) held at the University of California, Riverside, this editorial collective seeks to prioritize the goals of invitation, provocation, and exhortation rather than foundation. In the purposeful absence of a static or prescriptive scholarly agenda that poses as a *definitive* redefinition of ethnic studies, the still-forming project of critical ethnic studies is in some ways better understood as a principled gesture toward a radical intellectual openness. The purpose of this scholarly activist critique is multilayered, and every iteration of such a praxis—from dense theorization to grassroots political education—can and must affect the manner in which people apprehend and engage in the historical relations of power and violence that permeate their particular everyday.

It is within this openness that the thinkers anthologized in this volume collectively signify an intellectual and political urgency that responds to disparate though coexisting and relationally linked historical moments and conjunctures. Perhaps, in this sense, the emergent work of critical ethnic studies (CES) can also be conceptualized as an attempt to convene these differently

located, disparately conditioned scholarly labors into something resembling a field of political-intellectual struggle with dynamic, multiple, and radically divergent focal points. To take such a spatial conceptualization of the CES project seriously, this is to argue that the ostensible field of critical ethnic studies practices and struggles is neither *even* nor *owned*. There is not one thing, institution, or site called critical ethnic studies. Rather it is an impulse emerging from divergent conversations and sites desiring to build on previous work in ethnic studies while simultaneously respecting the political and intellectual movements that gave birth to it inside and outside of the academy.

*Critical Ethnic Studies: A Reader* convenes these multiple and at times divergent genealogies of ethnic studies and calls attention to the urgency of articulating a critical ethnic studies in and for the twenty-first century. In this sense the *critical* in critical ethnic studies is less a critique of ethnic studies projects as we have come to know them and more a gesturing to the dual meaning of the word as both vital and precarious. If the essays in this volume articulate vital or urgent critiques of their respective objects of analysis, the kind of intellectual risk-taking required to engage in such a critique undergoes a certain precariousness and vulnerability vis-à-vis disciplinary protocols, institutional mandates, and neoliberal instrumentalizations of knowledge. There is moreover another valence of precarity suggested by the institutional precarity of this kind of intellectual labor: actual lives rendered precarious. Advancing an acute refutation of racial capitalist, colonial, and settler modernity's installation of land as property (as well as of particular peoples as dehumanized epiphenomena of conquered landscapes and racial chattel alienated from land), the scholars engaged in these inaugural iterations of critical ethnic studies exhibit varying intimacy with the spatial and historical disequilibria produced by regimes of racial and racializing, epochal and ad hoc violence.

The attempt to convene such political-intellectual workers in the context of this book is thus not sufficiently characterized as a conventional effort to bridge academic divides, construct or revivify coalitions, or build new paradigms for ethnic studies research and scholarship. Contrary to the notion of an intellectual vanguard, the contributors to this volume convey a more generous understanding of the critical ethnic studies project. Reflecting the capacious spirit of the first CESA conference, held in March 2011, these authors suggest a notion of critical ethnic studies that is premised on a convivial sense of urgent participation, intellectual vulnerability, and scholarly audacity. Each of them articulates an intellectual excitement that is inseparable from the social-historical violences that have produced and necessitated such study.

Many readers of this volume will be familiar with recent works in one or more scholarly areas that have contributed to, challenged, or decisively departed from the broad intellectual contours of ethnic studies and related fields. Much of the critically incisive scholarship we understand to be centrally situated in black studies, queer studies, Native American studies, cultural studies, and gender studies, for example, has either rearticulated, radically disrupted, or transformed the generally (and often presumptively) coalition- and alliance-based intellectual infrastructures of ethnic studies. Along these lines the contributors to this anthology construct a dynamic, nonforeclosed working frame through which to bring focal attention to an ongoing problem that marks ethnic studies, including some of its critical ethnic studies iterations: that is, the changing apparatus of epistemological tensions, ontological discontinuities, and historical-experiential incommensurabilities that define the genealogies of the insurgent scholarly fields that ostensibly compose the intellectual and institutional moorings of ethnic studies. While there is no way to adequately schematize these tensions, discontinuities, and incommensurabilities here, it is nonetheless worth emphasizing that the intellectual lineages and lived historical materialities of black studies, Native American studies, indigenous studies, Chicano/a studies, Puerto Rican studies, Asian American studies, Latino/a studies, and other (presumably constituent) fields of ethnic studies simply cannot be encapsulated into a unifying institutional regime or discrete scholarly rubric. This generative impossibility echoes throughout the emerging field of critical ethnic studies and may come to animate rather than undermine it.

Of course critical ethnic studies is not contained within CESA or its conferences. In fact the cofounders of CESA structured the organization with the intent of being nonproprietary about its name, welcoming myriad configurations to self-organize as critical ethnic studies projects. Thus, in keeping with the divergent histories of critical ethnic studies, this volume does not purport to tell *the* story of critical ethnic studies. Rather it puts into conversation some of these multiple strands as a provocation to further this impulse. Similarly this introduction is not an exhaustive account of the problematic with which critical ethnic studies concerns itself but an invitation to a perpetual and always unfolding critical inquiry into the objects, methods, presuppositions, and analytics of ethnic studies.

This anthology is part of a project to imagine a collectivity and recognition beyond institutionally mediated hierarchies of difference, beyond disappearance for those of us whose bodies, thoughts, and cultures have been

deemed disposable. Our method was collaborative, working across Ethnic Studies fields and subfields to achieve a conversation between pieces, scenes, and communities that are too often separated by discipline and geography. While interested in building a constellation of response, our efforts signal the ways in which difference must be respected and understood as a unique front for contestation and refusal against systems of imperialism, surveillance, and structural harm. The necessity of movement—personal, intellectual, collective, political—is stressed in the pages to come and, we hope, will carry over in abundance in our shared spaces of collective thought and struggle.

## Section Descriptions

### THE MULTICULTURAL NATION AND THE VIOLENCE OF LIBERAL RIGHTS

As a liberal corrective to long-standing histories of exclusion, the contemporary regime of hegemonic multiculturalism nominally includes previously marginalized and exploited peoples in selective institutional sites of civil societies. This pluralist dispensation of rights has fabricated a universal, liberated (multicultural) subject from material histories of domination, displacement, and unfreedom. Critical ethnic studies attempts to interrogate the grand telos emplotted by the narrative of liberal multicultural inclusion, recognition, and equality. The radical intellectual labors encompassed in this volume turn the multiculturalist institutional imperatives—of diversity, tolerance, civility, and the postracial, to name a few—against themselves in order to reveal how the formal dispensation of liberal rights at once conditions and covers over a dispersion of continued violence.

It has been precisely during the period of liberal multiculturalism's emergence as a hegemonic national cultural structure—an emergence that has included various liberal appropriations and rearticulations of ethnic studies—that the proliferation of gendered racial *state violence* has reached new heights. The rise of the U.S. and global prison industrial complex and carceral-criminalization regime, for example, offers a stark historical-empirical rebuttal to the ideological overtures of liberal multiculturalism. While liberal rhetorics of diversity valorize the possibilities of vindicated, multicultural citizenship, the cultural and material institutionalization of racist state violence has displaced or socially liquidated entire geographies and demographics of people through the technologies of policing and incarceration. In fact this example indicates how the very structuring of liberal

citizenship is symbiotic with or constitutively dependent on forms of institutionalized violence.

Shana L. Redmond addresses how the politics of identity has contributed uncritically to a politics of identification. Guided by the genealogies and provocations presented by James Baldwin, Redmond's discussion of contemporary political mobilizations seeks to trouble the postracial move to identification as a means of liberal political advance. Troy Davis and Trayvon Martin are the subjects whose movement resurrection highlights the fiction of the "I am . . ." narratives that are used as a tactical shorthand within the imagined solidarity of redress. Redmond argues that the "method used as critique subscribes to and relies upon long-standing violences against the African-descended in the United States that further dismiss the particularities of black existence and thereby devalue black life."

In his treatment of black and brown alliances and fissures, John Márquez offers a critique of the structural maintenance and mobilization of the black-white binary by liberal actors in government, law enforcement, social movements, and academic institutions. His chapter, "Juan Crow," takes aim at the way a decolonial political future is crippled by liberal multiculturalism in schools and public discourse, becoming a way of "disremembering" histories of activism, from immigration and labor to officially sanctioned civil rights. By placing into conversation narrative strategies from across the United States, as well as the counterhegemonic articulations of postwar activists and intellectuals, Márquez diagnoses the fallacies and failures of postracial democracy and invites alternative practices of political, community, and discursive accountability and camaraderie.

João H. Costa Vargas asks, "Why is it that, when black suffering and death are momentarily centered, they are almost always displaced by conversations that recenter the experiences of nonblacks?" Vargas invites the reader to engage in freedom dreams that require exercising a political sensibility whose energy derives from at least two sources: first, an immanent critique of the employment of and belief in tropes related to modern, liberal-democratic citizenship principles, and second, the recognition that what is needed to break down regimes of objectifying subjection is to imagine the unimaginable, embody the abject, and venture into the terrifying. More specifically, when, and if, ever so reluctantly, non-, near-, or antiblack people become, in some measure, and even if temporarily, of all things, black themselves, an interesting opportunity to engage with freedom dreams presents itself.

Given the complicity of the state in its apparatuses of violence, Lindsey Schneider calls on critical ethnic studies to denaturalize the form of the

nation-state. Building on the work of Native studies scholars who have critiqued the “politics of recognition,” Schneider looks at how contemporary discourse around gay marriage and treaty rights positions these struggles in relation to the nation-state. Framing state-sanctioned rights as the ultimate goal—be they tribal members’ rights to fish off the reservation or the tribal government’s rights to regulate the institution of marriage—reinforces the legitimacy of the settler state. Linking these struggles, however, creates a space to rethink the meaning of sovereignty in terms of decolonization rather than a politics of recognition by the nation-state. In doing so Schneider calls for a critical ethnic studies that denaturalizes the nation-state.

At the same time, Jin Haritaworn interrogates social movements’ complicity in white supremacy through their adoption of “hate crimes” organizing as the model by which to address racial violence. Haritaworn terms this model the “hate/crime paradigm,” which sticks criminality and pathology to bodies and populations that are always already seen as hateful. Thus a critical ethnic studies analytic cannot be satisfied by allying with social movements without a robust interrogation of the contradictions within the movements themselves.

In a far-ranging conversation moderated by Sarita See, Glen Coulthard and Dylan Rodríguez confront a central political contradiction: How do we make sense of the fact that racist and colonial structures of human fatality have persisted, and at times seem to have grown in reach and sophistication, in the aftermath of the past half century’s major movements for progressive social transformation as well as liberal shifts in racial and colonial social texts, including the emergence of multiculturalism and state-ordained national antiracism? In a conversation that ranges from George Zimmerman to the Occupy Movement, Idle No More, and the Pelican Bay hunger strike, Coulthard and Rodríguez reflect on the profound obligations and limits that confront the scholar of differential decolonizing movements, Native and non-Native.

#### CRITICAL ETHNIC STUDIES PROJECTS MEET THE NEOLIBERAL UNIVERSITY

While we do not further rehearse the narrations of the foundational moments of ethnic studies here, it is worth emphasizing that ethnic studies is in fact born of *multiple* conditions of possibility, which both encompass and exceed the vibrant, militant student- and community-based movements that have exerted demands for socially relevant and socially transformative educational infrastructures. In other words, the precedents of intellectual labor and



historical experience that have constituted the material contexts for various institutional iterations of ethnic studies must now be seen to fundamentally exceed the TWLF moment, and the origin story of the field thus necessarily opens to new narratives and multiple intellectual genealogies.

The essays in this section grapple with how the white supremacist university is also now a neoliberal university. Against this institutional logic and rendering, these essays gesture to the ways critical ethnic studies projects have the potential to articulate profound challenges and alternatives to the neoliberal university.

Long T. Bui calls on ethnic studies scholars to question how the public university remains intact as an unproblematized social model of advancement by interrogating the necropolitics of the public university—the collateral damage that the academic industrial complex incurs in securing advantages for some. Bui reads Asian American studies and its scholars against neoliberal claims by the University of California to provide a “better life,” in so doing challenging the precarious privilege of Asian Americans and constructions of the “model minority.”

Nada Elia focuses on the international academic solidarity movement with Palestinian liberation. Engaging the current Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) Campaign that targets the complicity of Israeli academic institutions in the occupation of Palestine and its apartheid practices throughout Israel, Elia calls on academics and others to mobilize support within the academy for the BDS Campaign and demonstrates that such action can refresh and enliven radical inquiry and scholarship in the United States.

As Tania Das Gupta argues, the academic industrial complex is not monolithic. While university restructuring, consolidation, and abuse of power are rampant, Das Gupta uses the case of the Atkinson College reorganization at York University as a way to highlight the fact that the university also harbors sites of resistance and possibilities for constructing alternative educational methodologies. From this specific location Das Gupta details the struggles of a program to build such alternatives within the confines of the neoliberal university.

David Lloyd provides an extended analysis of the neoliberal university. Through a discussion of critical ethnic studies and its multiply situated theorists, Lloyd analyzes how the temptation for ethnic studies to remain at the level of critique actually serves to solidify rather than challenge the academic industrial complex. Scales of institutional value—of persons, labor, and scholarship—are cited as that which the CES project must dismantle such

that inquiry and the social movements aligned with it are fostered as contests to the academic industrial complex.

Similarly Dan Berger calls for a renewed project of camaraderie between ethnic studies projects and the sociopolitical movements from which they arise (and continue to study and announce). Using Foucault as a founding theorist of knowledge, Berger names an investment in new processes of its production by highlighting the work of scholar-activists beyond the academy, namely J. Sakai, Butch Lee, and Red Rover, who form part of a Chicago-based revolutionary intellectual circle. In noting their absence within contemporary works of academic scholarship, Berger begins to generate a new archive of documents and practices that will productively shape a twenty-first-century project of critical ethnic studies.

#### THE BODY AND THE DISPENSATIONS OF RACIAL CAPITAL

Racial capital's dispensations—as distribution, management, and disposal—operate nimbly on multiple scales, from the planetary to the corporeal. Just as continents, regions, colonies, territories, and nations have been and continue to be racial capital's sites of violent abstraction, extraction, and exploitation, the gendered racial and sexualized body is the intimate terrain that is simultaneously produced by such violent dispensations but also exceeds them. These precarious, vulnerable, and disposable bodies exist in intimate proximity to racial capital's thriving necropolitical regimes; racial capital depends upon their continued vitality as a site of exploitation, yet their very disposability is also a source of surplus value.

The essays in this section offer analyses that focus on the intimate violence wrought by racial capital at the scale of the body. They reveal how the body registers a capacity to bear such violence but also to thwart it. Whether laboring, performing, disabled, transgender, or queer, the body refuses to become the fresh body count of racial capital's skeletal remains even as it carries the living memories of the previous body counts produced by the epochal violence of racial capitalist modernity's symbiosis with a variety of colonialisms.

Nirmala Erevelles builds on the work of Hortense Spillers to question the assumption that the acquisition of a disabled identity always occurs outside historical context. In the specific historical context of slavery, the attribution of disability to the female captive body, for instance, enabled this body to become a site where the flesh was the prime commodity of exchange in the violent conflation of both profit and pleasure. Erevelles situates disability not as the condition of being but of becoming; this becoming is a historical event,

and further, it is its material context that is critical in the theorizing of disabled bodies and subjectivities.

Bo Luengsuraswat also focuses on the nonnormative body, in particular the relationships between racial and gender identity. He argues that Bobby Cheung's art practice resignifies the cultural signifiers of femininity and womanhood into an articulation of Asian American transgender maleness. Luengsuraswat's essay engages in broader lines of inquiry concerning the limits of trans- and homonormativity, the contours of Asian American *gendered* racialization, the problematics of the art world, and the labors of global capital.

Andrew Uzendoski's essay addresses global capital, in particular the relationship between capitalism and violence through the work of Indra Sinha, whose novel *Animal's People* makes visible neoliberal capitalism's economic ferocity as a kind of "slow violence" that produces a gradually materializing genocide. Uzendoski argues that Sinha's novel provides an "alternative historiography" that challenges the temporality of neoliberal capitalism and its uneven allocation of risk.

Stephanie Nohelani Teves centers indigenous performance artists as a site for rearticulating indigeneity. Teves complicates the (non)performances of indigeneity by the Kanaka Maoli drag artist Cocoa Chandelier, whose performance at the Miss Gay USA drag pageant in Hawai'i is the scene of investigation and grounds Teves's theorization of Hawaiian cultural performativity, which serves as an act of revision within prevailing, iconic performances of indigeneity, such as the hula girl. Using performance and postcolonial theorists, Teves argues that Chandelier complicates visual exchange and rebuts long-standing colonial and capitalist practices of consumption, thereby contesting and expanding the space available to indigenous performance artists.

#### MILITARISM, EMPIRE, AND WAR:

#### THE SECURITY STATE AND STATES OF INSECURITY

The national security state—most muscularly embodied by the United States but globally projected—generates and wages multiple wars on multiple fronts. Whether declared or undeclared, domestic or foreign, cold or hot, legal or extralegal, territorial or extraterritorial, wars proliferate and metastasize. U.S. militarism and empire are at once produced by and are themselves the products of a warfare state. The wars of settler colonialism conditioned and continue to condition the very formation and cohesion of the United States. Imperial adventures and nation-building projects abroad secure resources in the name of security and democracy.

What and whose security is named in the national security state's waging of permanent war? If such war becomes synonymous with genocidal and biopolitical violence, the targeting of variously gendered racial populations, corporate profiteering, and the extension of U.S. imperial hegemony, then what constitutes security? For whom is security guaranteed, and who becomes collateral damage in producing security? Indeed U.S. national security has ushered in radical states of insecurity and penury for a global majority. These states of insecurity—across political, economic, and ecological terrains—render lives and ways of life vulnerable to attack and apocalyptic transmogrifications. The essays in this section point to the urgent intellectual, political, and ethical task of imagining and creating alternative states of security in the double sense of carrying out insurrections against the state such that warfare is not its primary *raison d'être* and creating states or conditions of security that sustain ways in which communities can live the life they want to live.

David M. Hernández addresses the relationship between militarism, security, and immigrant incarceration. Immigrant detention in the United States is an obscured and flexible enforcement power executed historically by proxy entities and institutions, including a web of domestic and international carceral sites and partners. Ultimately institutional obscurity, Hernández suggests, makes detention a robust and flexible enforcement power, lending itself to other government agendas, from fighting crime, drugs, and terrorism to managing labor and producing political currency. Hernández problematizes the prevailing logics both guiding and seeking to reform the detention regime, unmasking and intervening in the obscured discursive and institutional formations of immigrant detention in the United States.

Jason Luna Gavilan's chapter addresses Filipino sailors' shifting racial locations in the military hierarchy of the U.S. Navy during World War II. Using archival documents Gavilan explores Filipinos' hierarchical location among a complex system of U.S. military racial segregation and explores varying "preferences" for Filipino messmen in relation to other racially subordinated military personnel as well as the civilian complaints about racial segregation in a time of war. Gavilan considers these civilian pressures and geopolitical relationship between the United States and the Philippines, which led to the U.S. military's reluctant and cosmetic makeover of its racist enlistment system before the ultimate integration of the U.S. military after World War II.

Gilberto Rosas explores contemporary complex racial dynamics resulting from the ongoing securitization of the U.S.-Mexico border. In particular Rosas explores the concept of a "thickening" border, expanding both north

and south through interrelated social forces: global efforts at immigration and drug enforcement, cultural and racial mixing or *mestizaje*, and emerging forms of undocumented youth activism and identity formation. He suggests that borders, *mestizaje*, and “illegal” identities have been dramatically reworked and resignified on the ground.

Ronak K. Kapadia identifies art as an alternative site to deconstruct the logics of U.S. global warfare through an examination of the critical and social potential of the contemporary aesthetic works of Wafaa Bilal, an Iraqi artist based in New York City. In this reading Kapadia proposes the concept of a “queer calculus” as an alternative mode of understanding the proliferation of drone warfare and the dominant militarized vision of U.S. imperialism that lies at its core. Queer calculus is a theoretical strategy that generates an account of both persistent systems and structures undergirding U.S. global counterinsurgency warfare and alternative logics, affects, and affiliations produced by racialized subjects in response.

Keith P. Feldman excavates the historically dynamic technologies of war making and racialization within the visual field. By using the iconic scene of the Situation Room at the moment of Osama bin Laden’s murder, Feldman articulates a theory of “racialization from above” that is made possible by the persistent flexibility of the U.S. border and frontier and its weapons of extermination, namely the aerial drones employed with alarming regularity by U.S. operatives in theaters of combat abroad as well as along the borders of the nation-state. Feldman links the logics of this extralegal and extraterritorial expansion to histories and presents of settler colonialism in the United States and Israel and in so doing places the “war on terror” within a genealogy of recognizable scopic regimes and imperial expansion.

#### FUGITIVE SOCIALITIES AND ALTERNATIVE FUTURES

The sheer variety of colonial and neocolonial formations has necessitated fugitive socialities, or ways of living, being, and relating that have taken flight from the dominant and can only be glimpsed in fleeting moments. How can CES contribute to long-standing and complex debates about the meanings and differentiations among decolonization, decolonial struggle, and anticolonialism? The essays in this section gesture to the alternative futures that various moments and projects of anticolonialism and decolonization have attempted to chart and might still realize. Between the regret of an imperfect past and the anticipation of a utopic future there lies an interregnum whose time can be seized for instants of critical reflection. The urgency of identifying the fatal unfreedom that the monumental yet banal violence of colonialism

continues to produce nurtures political subjectivities that are compelled to imagine decolonial futures.

Neferti M. Tadiar's essay argues that decolonization entails a rethinking of existing social analytics and genealogies of empire. Tadiar offers such a rethinking by conceptualizing "remaindered life" as an alternative form of social reproduction consisting of "generative associations and acts, social capacities and aspirations, agencies of imagination and practice." This form of social reproduction corrodes dominant social relations and instead produces fugitive socialities, which may be made available to obstruct the spread of empire.

Robert Stam and Ella Shohat argue that critical ethnic studies and identity politics must be seen against the backdrop of the "seismic shift" created by the decolonization of world culture. Central twentieth-century events—World War II, the Jewish Holocaust, Third Worldist anticolonialism, the civil rights struggle, and minority liberation movements—all simultaneously delegitimized the West as the axiomatic center of reference and affirmed the rights of non-European peoples emerging from the yoke of colonialism and racism. Within this context Shohat and Stam critically interrogate the convergence of anti-identity politics in left- and right-wing discourse. They call for a recuperation of a nonessentialist identity politics that is capable of addressing identity-based oppression.

Nelson Maldonado-Torres elucidates the significance of decolonization and elaborates the significance of what he calls the "decolonial turn," a recognition of the ethical, political, and epistemological significance of decolonization as a project in the twentieth century. In particular he reads Aimé Césaire's *Discourse on Colonialism* as a discourse on decolonial methodology and the response of a black colonized subject to the Cartesian project. In doing so he reveals how Césaire critically dislocates the basis of the European civilization project.

Laura Pulido examines the debate over Mexican and Mexican American racial identity, in particular the debates over racial choices and prescriptions among national Latina/o organizations in the mid-twentieth century. Pulido provides an analysis of the Asociación Nacional México-Americana (ANMA), a radical political and civil rights organization in the Southwest linked to the Communist Party and the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers. Although short-lived, ANMA broke from peer Latina/o organizations that asserted a white identity as a strategy for achieving rights and self-protection from racial discrimination.

Alexander G. Weheliye interrogates the conceptual *carte blanche* granted to white European thinkers. Focusing on Foucault's notion of "biopolitics"

and Agamben's idea of "bare life," Weheliye demonstrates that they place racial difference in a field prior to and at a distance from conceptual contemplation. In doing so he reveals just how comprehensively the coloniality of Man suffuses the disciplinary and conceptual formations of knowledge we labor under, and how far we have yet to go in decolonizing these structures.