# Uganda AC

#### Educational spaces like debate aren’t neutral. The eurocentrism that plagues every round frames social norms – the normative function of identity is reinforced by Eurocentrism, causes inevitable inequality in and out of the space. Squo education has taught us to understand the US not as a destructive colonial hegemon, rather we conceptualize US heg as a positive thing or abstract from it in its entirety – the traditional policymaking paradigm guarantees imperialism.

Reid-Brinkley 08, University of Pittsburgh Assistant Professor Communication, 8 [Shanara Reid-Brinkley, Rhetoric PhD & Prof @ Pitt, and the most competitively successful black woman in CEDA history, “The Harsh Realities Of “Acting Black”: How African-American Policy Debaters Negotiate Representation Through Racial Performance And Style”, <http://www.comm.pitt.edu/faculty/documents/reid-brinkley_shanara_r_200805_phd.pdf>, accessed 7/7/13) Mitchell observes that the stance of the policymaker in debate comes with a “sense of detachment associated with the spectator posture.”115 In other words, its participants are able to engage in debates where they are able to distance themselves from the events that are the subjects of debates. Debaters can throw around terms like torture, terrorism, genocide and nuclear war without blinking. Debate simulations can only serve to distance the debaters from real world participation in the political contexts they debate about. As William Shanahan remarks: “…the topic established a relationship through interpellation that inhered irrespective of what the particular political affinities of the debaters were. The relationship was both political and ethical, and needed to be debated as such. When we blithely call for United States Federal Government policymaking, we are not immune to the colonialist legacy that establishes our place on this continent. We cannot wish away the horrific atrocities perpetrated everyday in our name simply by refusing to acknowledge these implications” (emphasis in original).116 The “objective” stance of the policymaker is an impersonal or imperialist persona**.** The policymaker relies upon “acceptable” forms of evidence, engaging in logical discussion, producing rational thoughts. As Shanahan, and the Louisville debaters’ note, such a stance is integrally linked to the normative, historical and contemporary practices of power that produce and maintain varying networks of oppression. In other words, the discursive practices of policy-oriented debate are developed within, through and from systems of power and privilege. Thus, these practices are critically implicated in the maintenance of hegemony**.**

#### Thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the debater that best resists white hegemony.

## First is the Squo

Despite the atrocities the US has remained complicit in then numerous accounts of abuses as a result of their aid Shank and Regan 13 <https://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/world-report/2013/06/19/how-american-military-assistance-goes-wrong-in-africa> **June 19, 2013, at 8:00 a.m** Michael Shank is an adjunct assistant professor at New York University's Center for Global Affairs. America must be far more careful about who winds up on the receiving end of its military aid.

**AS THE U.S. GOVERNMENT** gears up to militarize more of the Middle East by arming rebels in Syria, we are witnessing a similar mission creep toward the African continent. Not merely in the more obvious military interventions into Libya, Mali or Somalia, or military bases in Niger or Djibouti, but through growing security partnerships in places including Kenya, Nigeria and even Mauritania. The ramp up of military and counterterror assistance to these countries – and the human rights abuses committed by these same actors – is seriously troubling. While President Barack Obama's recent counterterrorism speech failed to address these problems, ongoing events in Nigeria have spurred Secretary of State John Kerry to express ["deep concern"](http://www.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2013/05/209576.htm) around human rights abuses committed by the Nigerian military, a major U.S. counterterror partner. But given that a recent [U.N. report](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=13308&LangID=E) also found U.S.-trained Congolese troops guilty of mass rape and other atrocities, it's time for more than mere expression of concern. We need vigilant, ongoing accountability around U.S. military training and equipment – especially as the House Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities included some alarming language on U.S. security assistance in its latest markup of the National Defense Authorization Act. The [subcommittee](http://armedservices.house.gov/index.cfm/files/serve?File_id=d9978d14-4f0f-4af2-aaef-ff315d003db8) raised concerns that current U.S. standards – known as the Leahy laws – would be interpreted "more broadly" than intended, causing combatant commands to be significantly "restricted" in "a number of countries across the globe." Those restrictions, however, which the House subcommittee felt might be too limiting, are one of few mechanisms currently in place to ensure accountability and respect for human rights. Yet these restrictions are not strong enough. While they sometimes serve to cut off aid from specific units or individuals, they ultimately do not prevent ongoing partnerships with chronically abusive governments. This "[Western money" and "African boots"](http://www.npr.org/2013/03/29/175712413/western-money-african-boots-a-formula-for-africas-conflicts) approach to security assistance programs is increasingly seen by Washington as an innovative alternative to large-scale wars – one that allows for "[sharing" the burden of security](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/04/05/fact-sheet-us-security-sector-assistance-policy) and empowering foreign forces to address their own problems. But without careful accountability and rigorous evaluation, its implementation looks a lot more like short-sighted Cold War policies in Latin America than local empowerment. Take a look at how bad it's gotten as part of the mission creep on the African continent's northern half. Human Rights Watch released a [report last month](http://www.hrw.org/news/2013/05/29/kenya-police-abuse-nairobi-s-refugees) documenting the abuse, rape and torture of at least 1,000 Somali refugees by U.S.-backed Kenyan police forces as retaliation for supposed terrorist attacks. This follows a report by the Open Society Justice Initiative [released last November](http://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/reports/counterterrorism-and-human-rights-abuses-kenya-and-uganda-world-cup-bombing-and-beyond) that connected U.S. counterterror assistance and influence to systemic human rights abuses in Kenya and Uganda, and another [account](http://latitude.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/05/07/fighting-terrorism-in-mauritania-even-it-means-torture/?src=recg) of U.S.-backed torture in Mauritania. And then there's always the Ethiopian government, another major recipient of U.S. assistance, which has used anti-terrorism laws to actively repress civil society, crack down on peaceful dissent and limit the civil rights of Muslims and others. While no security force is perfect, the emerging pattern of U.S. military assistance to Africa is one of partnership with governments and forces known for widespread violations – and few efforts toward accountability or long-term, systemic reform. The U.S. has taken some small steps to acknowledge the problematic nature of human rights violations, with Kerry admitting that they can "escalate the violence and fuel extremism." But as the U.S. continues to profess support for reform in each of the countries in question, it also continues to provide aid like [surveillance drones](http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/07/21/us-kenya-usa-military-idUSBRE86K0H020120721) to governments that imprison activists and further marginalize oppressed communities. The counter by U.S. officials is to claim that military aid is actually improving human rights, good governance and rule of law, arguing that, while complicated, this cooperation is necessary and effective in countering militant extremism. This assertion, however, has no backing. Given the recent [U.S. track record in Mali](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/14/world/africa/french-jets-strike-deep-inside-islamist-held-mali.html?pagewanted=1&_r=0&hp), in which U.S.-trained officers both defected to the side of insurgents and undertook a military coup, there's reason to believe that U.S. assistance is neither effective nor supporting just governance. General Carter Ham, former Commander of the U.S. Africa Command, stated that U.S. training in Mali "didn't spend, probably, the requisite time focusing on values, ethics and military ethos." Since then, he and others at AFRICOM have told members of Congress that steps have been taken to improve related programs. But the necessary steps to ensure this doesn't happen again – that is, to regularly evaluate and hold this assistance accountable – aren't happening.

#### The United States sacrifices the Ugandan people for military expediency – its military aid secures support for US interests and props up Museveni’s repression.

Kakande 18:

Ugandan investigative journalist, has worked to expose abuses of migrant workers in the Middle East, “US Funding of Ugandan Military Aids in Citizens’ Repression”, <https://truthout.org/articles/us-funding-of-ugandan-military-aids-in-citizens-repression/>, 9-9-18, //

Museveni has responded brutally, as he has repeatedly during his 32-year tenure as president. That day, Robert Kyagulanyi Ssentamu — the popular singer known as “Bobi Wine,” who also serves in the parliament — [was arrested](http://www.theeastafrican.co.ke/news/ea/Ugandan-police-arrest-MP-Bobi-Wine/4552908-4712038-i0l9osz/index.html). After a music career of more than 15 years, Ssentamu has emerged as the most formidable political opposition against Museveni. Numerous disturbances have broken out around the country. Yasin Kawuma, Ssentamu’s driver, [was killed](https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2018/08/uganda-investigate-death-of-opposition-politicians-driver/). On August 23, after not being seen or heard from for 10 days, Ssentamu was arraigned on charges of treason in a military court for allegedly possessing fire arms in his hotel room despite the fact that he is a civilian. Many were [alarmed](https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2018/08/uganda-bobi-wine-arrested/568549/) at his appearance, bearing physical signs of torture while he has been detained. However, Ssentamu’s treatment is not an anomaly. Museveni has repressed his opposition on many occasions, all with the financial assistance of the US. The US Ignores Human Rights Abuses of Its Allies President Museveni has benefited extensively from US military support, most notably [$444 million](http://visuals.sipri.org/) last year. Museveni’s [record on human rights](https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2018/country-chapters/uganda) is clear in its abusive extent, including documented cases of torture and arbitrary detention of opposition leaders and their supporters. The Museveni government has repeatedly denied due process, imposed severe restrictions on press freedom and has been connected to numerous corruption scandals. But none of these circumstances has affected its relationship with the US. Museveni is among the US’s most reliable allies in Africa, never hesitating to send Ugandan troops on behalf of US interests to influence the outcomes of regional conflicts in [Somalia](https://allafrica.com/stories/201710270091.html), [South Sudan](http://southsudannewsagency.org/index.php/2018/04/17/uganda-accused-of-secretly-sending-troops-to-south-sudan/), the [Democratic Republic of Congo](http://www.africanews.com/2018/07/12/dr-congo-accuses-uganda-of-killing-12-fishermen-in-border-dispute/), [Rwanda](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-congo-democratic-rwanda-uganda-idUSBRE89F1RQ20121017) and [Kenya](https://www.tuko.co.ke/92111-day-president-museveni-declared-war-kenya.html#92111), where election-related violence broke out in 2007. In Sub-Saharan Africa, Museveni plays a role akin to the head of a brokerage firm for rebels, rebellions and peace missions. His role has extended to the Middle East, where he sent Ugandans to work as security guards for US forces [in Iraq](https://www.dandc.eu/en/article/many-soldiers-uganda-fought-us-iraq-war). He also recently announced he will be sending [8,000 troops](https://www.middleeasteye.net/news/arabic-press-review-ugandan-soldiers-headed-yemen-1313476290) to fight alongside troops of Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates in Yemen. As part of this relationship, [many troops](https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/monkey-cage/wp/2015/05/15/four-questions-and-answers-about-u-s-support-of-peacekeeping-in-africa/) in Uganda have been trained by the US military, including using sophisticated communications equipment, night-vision goggles and small surveillance drones – all from US defense contractors. Ugandan troops deployed to Somalia travel in mine-resistant vehicles that once ferried US soldiers around Afghanistan. Ugandan choppers engaged in operations against warlord Joseph Kony, are powered by fuel [paid for by the US](https://foreignpolicy.com/2016/02/18/is-the-us-military-propping-up-ugandas-elected-autocrat-museveni-elections/). As disturbances have multiplied and become more volatile in the aftermath of Ssentamu’s arrest, the US embassy in Uganda recently [issued travel warnings](https://ug.usembassy.gov/demonstration-alert-u-s-embassy-kampala-uganda-august-19-2018/) to any US citizens planning trips to Uganda, cautioning them to not get caught in the crossfire. Meanwhile, sanctions or cuts in military aid would seem unlikely, given the record of Museveni’s abuses and violations of human rights and how long they have not been acknowledged by the US.

#### AND this aid makes Ugandan Leaders feel inviible, US relations mean patriarchal violence Is never solved for

#### The plan solves – Museveni has shifted away from enacting oppressive laws due to Western pressure.

Bariyo 14: [Nicholas Bariyo (Journalist for the Wall Street Journal), “Uganda's Attorney General Won't Appeal Ruling on Antigay Law,” Wall Street Journal, August 13 2014, <https://www.wsj.com/articles/ugandas-attorney-general-wont-appeal-anti-gay-law-ruling-1407946971>,

KAMPALA, Uganda—Uganda's attorney general has dropped plans to appeal a recent constitutional-court ruling that nullified the country's antigay law, officials said on Wednesday, dimming prospects that the legislation will be reintroduced soon. The development comes days after Ugandan President Yoweri Museveni told lawmakers from his ruling party that the reintroduction of the law "was not a priority." His stance marked an apparent shift from his earlier support for a law that was later intensely criticized by human-rights activists and Western governments for its harsh punishment of homosexuals. Under the law, offenders would have faced a 14-year prison sentence for a first conviction, and life imprisonment for "aggravated homosexuality," which include homosexual acts committed by a person who is HIV positive. The law is now undergoing a parliamentary review, said Justine Lumumba, the ruling party's chief whip. "The attorney general has already complied with a presidential directive to drop the intention to appeal to the Supreme Court" Ms. Lumumba said. After Uganda's constitutional court nullified the legislation on technical grounds, law makers started collecting signatures to reintroduce the legislation in Parliament. But analysts said the latest move indicates the redrafting process could drag out indefinitely. "Museveni has built a process with several sequential steps, each of which could carry its own delay. Nothing will happen quickly on this," said Asia Russell, director of international policy at Health GAP, a Ugandan advocacy group. Mr. Museveni, who attended a U.S.-Africa summit in Washington this month, told lawmakers in his ruling party on Monday that despite huge domestic support, Uganda had gone through "a difficult time" since the enactment of the law in February, said a spokesman for the presidency. Uganda receives around $2 billion a year in humanitarian and development aid from the West, including the U.S. and European Union, as well as from the World Bank. Mr. Museveni said he was concerned by a petition signed by a number of U.S. senators, who have asked President Barack Obama to strike Uganda and Nigeria off the list of U.S. trade partners for criminalizing homosexuality. Mr. Museveni said even if the law is to be re-enacted, it should be revised to ensure that it doesn't criminalize same-sex relationships between consenting adults, lawmakers who attended the meeting said. One lawmaker said Mr. Museveni warned that "our exports to American market risk being rejected because of this law."

## Second is Violence

#### Historically, Militarism in Uganda has manifested itself as a symbolic representation of patriarchal violence against women. Baderoon 14

*In Idi Amin’s Shadow: Women, Gender and Militarism in Uganda*. Alicia C Decker, 2014, Athen, Ohio, Ohio University Press Gabeba Baderoon abeba Baderoon is a South African poet and academic. She is the 2005 recipient of the Daimler Chrysler Award for South African Poetry.

There are many reasons to celebrate this book. Perhaps most importantly, Decker does justice to the place of gender, and of women, in history, particularly those who were silenced by military violence. Moreover, she does so by brilliantly employing central African feminist concepts in her book, and placing them in relation to more widely cited and therefore paradoxically more authoritative western scripts about feminism, overtly paradoxical in instances where it is African feminists who have engaged most directly with African contexts. But in Decker’s approach we don’t only learn about African concepts but about their complexity, for instance elucidating African concepts such as the relation of sex and gender as a non-biological relationship. We also find nuanced discussions of the work of pre-eminent African feminist scholars Amina Mama on militarism, Patricia McFadden on postcolonial and post- independence nationalisms, Jacklyn Cock on women’s roles in militarism during apartheid and the anti-apartheid struggle, Nakanyike Musisi on gender in post-independence Uganda, Yaliwe Clark’s research into post-conflict masculinities, and Nina Mba’s comparative scholarship on military and non-military political regimes in Nigeria – this is a truly wide-ranging and erudite account of African feminist thought, as befits someone who holds a Masters degree in Gender Studies from Makerere University. Examples of the subtlety of Decker’s approach includes an exemplary engagement with earlier scholarship, including the difference between warrior culture and militarised culture and previous gendered readings, such as Ali Mazrui’s concept of “political masculinity,” which have been both enabling and limiting. However, the major African feminist contribution of this book is not only to draw on its broad archive and to expose its readers a rich African conceptual heritage but to elucidate a general theory of militarism and gender through a case study of Uganda – *In Idi Amin’s Shadow* shows how militarism and state violence can become entrenched into state practices and eventually organise society around military violence as its core political principal. It traces how the logic of military violence can come to permeate a society and become ubiquitous, normalised and invisible, to the extent that people cannot imagine living differently. Citing the major feminist theorists Amina Mama and Margot Okazawa-Rey, Decker observes that militarism is “an extreme variant of patriarchy” which generates and consolidates particular forms of gender. Militarism – which includes systemic violations of the bodies of citizens through the use of rape and sexual violence as modes of terror and the production of masculinities beholden to the military state – can nonetheless become a common and almost “ordinary” political strategy because it is highly effective in enabling violations of governance through corruption and appropriation of resources. We also see that men who are drawn into militarised culture are nonetheless also vulnerable to it, and are in constant danger of falling out of favour, or being seen as feminine or weak. This requires ever more demonstrations of hyper-masculinity and leads to escalating levels of violence. Indeed, in Amin’s Uganda the idea of protection as a function of the state itself became despised and feminised to the extent that the police were seen as “women” who did not go to war, a contempt that “naturalised the violence and domination of militarism,” as Decker points out. A critical view of gender and militarism is therefore crucial, both because militarism entrenches destructive forms of masculinity and femininity but also because an instrumental emphasis on women’s roles during military rule helps to obscure some of the violence of military logic by foregrounding limited advances made by some women, and promoting an idea of the military as protective, responsible and strong. Indeed, reading this, it is unsurprising to note the prominent use of the image of the family to promote militarism – Amin named himself Big Daddy, and promised that the military protects “the home” and “the ones at home”. How can women be nurturing and yet militarised? Amin crafted a paradoxical image for promoting women’s visible participation in the state, yet was responsible for unprecedented levels of brutality against both women and men. As Decker notes, militarised masculinity demands “physical strength, endurance, discipline and heterosexual competency”, and a militarised femininity requires “nurturance, patience and support”. Because militarism is an extreme form of patriarchal gender, combat is central to generating militarised masculinity leading to heightened requirements for the exercise of violence, so the exclusion of women from the zone of conflict is required for women to support militarism “without threatening patriarchal social order”, by being symbolically central but physically excluded.

#### Uganda’s regime shows how drive for military power has come at the behest of black women - militarism and gendered violence are inextrably linked, our analysis is key to understanding this power dynamic Baderoon 2

*In Idi Amin’s Shadow: Women, Gender and Militarism in Uganda*. Alicia C Decker, 2014, Athen, Ohio, Ohio University Press Gabeba Baderoon abeba Baderoon is a South African poet and academic. She is the 2005 recipient of the Daimler Chrysler Award for South African Poetry.

Decker demonstrates to us the danger of overlooking both the spatial and temporal dimensions of militarism – firstly, militarism has a history. Idi Amin did not spring out of nowhere. He was literally the child of a history of systemic violence perpetrated by the British during colonial rule. The West Nile, the birthplace of Idi Amin, was an area subjected to pervasive impoverishment and marginalisation under the British, leaving few options but military service available to men. This was accompanied by the creation of a mythology of “martial tribes” – so that deliberate impoverishment was accompanied by a martial logic through the selective advancement of some Africans during colonial rule if they were deemed to be “reliable”, aligned to colonial ideology and racially advanced, and therefore given access to education and opportunities in the colonial administration, and the exclusion of others, who were described as racially inferior and relegated to poverty and military service. This was the pre-history of Amin’s military rule and helps to undercut ideas about the exceptionalism of Uganda. Secondly, militarism seeks always to expand itself. Decker demonstrates the extension of militarisation in social and civilian life in Uganda under the rule of Milton Obote and then almost immediately under Idi Amin – for instance, through the passing of laws that allowed military control over the administration of justice such as powers of arrest and what constituted evidence, the growth of paramilitary units, the establishment of military police, the subjection of civilian officials to military discipline, and the proliferation of powerful clandestine military intelligence units, who acted with increasing violence and impunity. As importantly, the voracious reach of militarised social structure is evident in the intrusion of militarism into the psyches and over the bodies of citizens. Shortly after seizing power, Amin chose consciously to focus on what women wore and banned miniskirts as a way to legitimate and expand military power by a highly visible and popular strategy. Such strategies of diversion and populism take over the space of public debate and simultaneously enable theft by stealth through extreme levels of plunder and political violence. To counter such a strategy of expanding state violence requires an ethical politics and courageous activism, as well as meticulous research and the reclamation of histories. Women’s and men’s insistent voices, such as in testimony before Uganda’s Commission of Inquiry into the Amin regime’s increasing use of “disappearances” helped to demonstrate that terror was a sustained and evolving state strategy under Idi Amin, and their testimony countered “the deafening silence of disappearance, indelibly recording a crime that was supposed to leave no trace.” In Decker’s interviews with them, Ugandan women and men both inside and outside the regime testified to the violence they suffered and that they witnessed, even when the effectiveness of the forums for such testimony were undermined by the regime. In Decker’s words, the women and men “refused to be silent, giving voice to a crime that was supposed to leave no trace.” Such histories also reveal the ambiguities and ambivalences of survival under a military regime, and show that some of the strategies that women followed in a logic of political survival during military rule included uneasy silence, complicity and unevenly benefitting from the transient opportunities offered by the regime. The proliferation of militarism is enabled by the myth of military utility as a solution to complex problems such as crime or economic inequality. The fantasy of efficient, targeted, effective military violence to address multifaceted social phenomena in fact obscures the way militarised violence exacerbates and perpetuates inequality, enables a vast scale of corruption, gendered and ethnic violence, profound psychological suffering, ethnic division and a cycle of political violence. Decker demonstrates that militarism proliferates and insinuates itself into broader forms of governance, ideology, bodily and social and intimate practices. This sense of state violence that intruded into private and ritual spaces and carried out with impunity under new laws passed by the military government has left effects far beyond 1979. Indeed, as Decker points out, a “culture of violence...became Amin’s most enduring legacy.” This is a work of history that deliberately seeks out voices that have been left out of the formal record, contributing to the field of “history as meaning” rather than solely “history as fact.” Such a history as meaning relies on informal channels such as personal memory and Decker acknowledges that such memory can suffer from elision, fracture and inaccuracy. She outlines the meticulous research through which she established the validity of the insights gleaned from her interviews, without ceding the central feminist method of attending to the voices of those who have been excluded and silenced by the powerful. Charges of inauthenticity, partiality and insignificance are often used to obscure the violence of dominant classes, and this book counters such claims by buttressing its use of women’s and marginalised men’s voices through exhaustive archival and documentary evidence. In describing the terrifying arbitrariness of opponents and ordinary citizens who were kidnapped or subjected to unexplained arrests and detention after which they were never seen again, Decker uses a noun as a verb – to be “disappeared” – which has travelled across postcolonial contexts from Latin America, and cites an unforgettable phrase from the Ugandan activist Thereza Mulindwa, who asserted that the country’s women had become “widows without graves.” These resonant terms suggest the need to create new concepts to describe repeated acts of state violence which had no precedent and crushed legal opposition. They also show the value of a comparative approach, for instance, for understanding militarism in other postcolonial and post-revolutionary states like Egypt and South Africa. Importantly, for scholars based in the north, Decker’s study of the unexceptional case of Uganda can allow us to understand better the “soft militarism” of non-military yet still militarised states, like the US.

#### And, the AC is a step away from making Blacks into instrumental tools for white consumptive logic. Black Women lose meaning as they are commodified and spectacularized in the belly of the world. Saidiya Hartman . (2016) The Belly of the World: A Note on Black Women’s Labors. Souls 18:1, pages 166-173.

The role of gender and sexual differentiation in the constitution of labor are especially complex in the context of slavery. On one hand, the category of labor insufficiently accounts for slavery as a mode of power, domination and production. The fungibility of the slave, the wanton uses of the black body for producing value or pleasure, and the shared vulnerabilities of the commodity, whether male or female, trouble dominant accounts of gender. Depending on the angle of vision or critical lexicon, the harnessing of the body as an instrument for social and physical reproduction unmakes the slave as gendered subject or reveals the primacy of gender and sexual differentiation in the making of the slave. Natal alienation is one of the central attributes of the social death of the slave and gendered and sexual violence are central to the processes that render the black child as by-product of the relations of production.6 At the same time, the lines of division between the market and the household which distinguished the public and the domestic and divided productive and reproductive labor for propertied whites does not hold when describing the enslaved and the carceral landscape of plantation. Reproduction is tethered to the making of human commodities and in service of the marketplace. For the enslaved, reproduction does not ensure any future other than that of dispossession nor guarantee anything other than the replication of racialized and disposable persons or “human increase” (expanded property-holdings) for the master. The future of the enslaved was a form of speculative value for slaveholders. Even the unborn were conscripted and condemned to slavery. “Kinship loses meaning,” according to Spillers, “since at any moment it can be invaded at any given and arbitrary moment by property relations.” Extending and revising this line of argument, Morgan notes the importance of maternity and reproduction in the evolution of the legal codification of slavery. “Women’s bodies became the definitional sites of racial slavery.” In North America, the future of slavery depended upon black women’s reproductive capacity as it did on the slave market. The reproduction of human property and the social relations of racial slavery were predicated upon the belly. Plainly put, subjection was anchored in black women’s reproductive capacities. The captive female body, according to Spillers, “locates precisely a moment of converging political and social vectors that mark the flesh as a prime commodity of exchange.”7

## Thus we affirm withdrawal of military aid from Uganda as a method of black feminist killjoy

#### Methods debate comes first and outweighs, fiat is illusory which means that we ought to question why we take actions, Black feminism breaks the hold Sewer

**Hadiya Sewer** is a third year PhD student in the Africana Studies Department at Brown University. She earned her B.A. in Sociology from Spelman College where she was a Mellon Mays Undergraduate Fellow. Hadiya’s many research interests include Africana feminism, Western empires and Caribbean subject formation, Caribbean philosophy, and radical political thought. She is one of the co organizers of the “Decolonizing the Racialized Female Subject: Black and Indigenous Women’s Self Making Under Empire” symposium. Her prospective dissertation examines the impact of American colonial rule on sovereignty, and questions of “the human” in the United States Virgin Islands. The project asks, “what does the continuous colonial subjection of the United States Virgin Islands tell us about blackness in the margins of the American empire?” http://mokomagazine.org/wordpress/notes-on-being-a-demonic-black-radical-feminist-killjoy-from-st-john-u-s-virgin-islands-by-hadiya-sewer-gibney/

“But if, following Foucault, we understand power as forming the subject as well, as providing the very condition of its existence and the trajectory of its desire, then power is not simply what we oppose, but also, in a strong sense, what we depend on for our very existence and what we harbor and preserve in the beings that we are (Butler 1997: 2).” “In each case, power that at first appears as external, pressed upon the subject, pressing the subject into subordination, assumes a psychic form that constitutes the subject’s self-identity (Butler 1997: 3).” If power is indeed shaping the subject, then American liberalism and capitalist frameworks have a specific impact on the development of the Black Caribbean colonial subject. A reading of Bogues (2010) suggests that the United States’ democratic dogma of liberal freedom as the only legitimate form of security promotes, “the deployment of a form of power by which self-regulated, individual subjectivity meshes with the drives of the imperium (Bogues 2010 location 250)”. Perhaps many Virgin Islanders have an increasing investment in “Man” since the possibility of surviving and gaining access to the fruits of the empire are made possible by citizenry and wealth. If this is true, then it is imperative that we understand how these investments are being made. Additionally, what alternative categories of the human are being created to challenge Man’s overrepresentations? “The theory of interpellation appears to stage a social scene in which a subject is hailed, the subject turns around, and the subject then accepts the terms by which he or she has been hailed.” (Butler 1997: 106) Is Butler’s reading of Althusser’s interpellation always accurate? I acknowledge that I am turning around and accepting the terms to some degree when I call myself a “demonic killjoy.” However, does the need for survival allow the marginalized subject to turn around and mock the terms by which he or she has been hailed? There appear to be so many examples of American Virgin Islanders being hailed and turning around to negate the terms. Rastafarianism is a prime example of this. Furthermore, there are moments when the Black colonial subject is hailed and they engage in subtle forms of resistance that undermine the racial schema. I think of all of the elderly women I’ve watched smash, or threaten to smash, the cameras of tourists who take their picture without permission. There is a shock and humiliation on the tourists’ face that makes me wonder what facial expression Derrida (2008) made when his cat gazed upon him naked. The figure of the dehumanized Black is an overrepresentation of a subaltern “other.” An actual person of African descent spoke and in doing so deconstructed the white privilege of setting the terms of visibility; they forced the recognition of humanity that may not have been acknowledged otherwise. We are often told of what the colonizer says of the colonized. However, it is also important to ask what the colonized say about the colonizer. I pen all of these notes on being a demonic radical Black Feminist killjoy because I want to know how Black subjects are formed, conversely self-fashioned and shaped by imperial domination as a result of America’s imperial presence, and the liberal “capturing of desire” (Bogues 2010). Furthermore, if we are to think of how to usher in the break that will erase the face of “Man” and move us towards a decolonized world and an autonomous U.S. Virgin Islands, then the conceptions of the human that emerge in the demonic subaltern must be centered in our episteme. This centering only occurs when we kill hegemonic joy and attempt to reorder the categories of thought even when it makes the privileged uncomfortable. There is so much that small spaces like St. John can teach us about being human and the American empire.
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Yet, I insist on being the demonic radical Black feminist killjoy, to use Sylvia Wynter (2000) and Sara Ahmed’s (2010) theorizations respectively, because I believe that discussions about racism in the U.S.V.I. are crucial if we are to create a better world and a more loving future. Colonialism orders categories of thought to construct a subhuman “other.” These schemas of racial, gendered, sexual, and economic difference solidified the invention of “Man” and simultaneously worked to institute “Demonic Grounds”, the absented presence of (Black, Native, lgbtq, poor) others who do not possess the characteristics of the overrepresented prototype of the human that pretends to be the very human itself: “Man.” Sylvia Wynter argues that “Man” is a specific mode of being human, one rooted in political subjectivity, biology, and economics. The “Demonic Ground” is the unknowable, the unrepresented, the irrational and chaotic figure in the prevailing schema in the Western world (Wynter 2000; McKittrick 2006). *“*I am not using the demonic to reference evil paranormal entities. *In mathematics, physics, and computer science,* “the demonic” connotes a working system that cannot have a determined or knowable outcome. *The demonic, then, is a non-deterministic schema*; it is a process that is hinged on uncertainty and non-linearity because the organizing principle cannot predict the future. This schema, this way of producing or desiring an outcome, calls into question ‘the always non-arbitrary, pre-prescribed’ parameters of sequential and classificatory linearity *(McKittrick 2006: xxiv).”* “Demonic grounds” is a very different sort of geography; one which is genealogically wrapped up in the historical, spatial unrepresentability of black femininity and, to return to the demonic model above, one that points to ways in which black women necessarily contribute to a re-presentation of human geography *(McKittrick xxvi).”* “Killjoys” embrace literal and figurative disruptions of hegemonic worldviews. On feministkilljoys.com, Ahmed notes that the killjoy is often called angry, ruins atmospheres, creates political disturbances, and will notice and name whiteness. I notice and name whiteness on St. John because I’m attempting to contribute to a re-presentation of American and Caribbean human geography by challenging the idea that our present moment is “post” or “neo” colonial, and locate the U.S.A in colonial legacies and practices. Below, I identify three sets of questions and lessons about St. John, racism, and American colonialism that I gather from being a demonic killjoy. **1)** If colonialism is a specter of the past that only haunts the contemporary moment through neocolonialism, how does the U.S.A account for the marginal position of America’s Virgin Islands? “For the American creed, the democratic dogma cannot be reconciled with colonialism. *As the Governor of Puerto Rico remarked in the Congressional hearings on Public Law 600, no Americans can be possessions of other Americans*. The effort to reconcile possession with American-ness has, accordingly, been a failure in both logic and life; and, in Puerto Rico, it has produced the phenomenon of what has been aptly termed American anti-colonial imperialism *(Lewis 1953: 42).”* Residents of American territories—the U.S.V.I, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Marianas—are an embodiment of this American paradox. If Americans cannot be possessions of other Americans, how can we define residents of American territories? I cannot vote for the President of the U.S. while residing at home. However, the American president has the right to send members of the territory to fight for the nation, as Gerard Luz James (2010) aptly pointed out in a United Nations Special Subcommittee on Decolonization Hearing. When I look to my quotidian experiences with telephone companies, bar tenders, and divisions of motor vehicles, I find similar questions. Passport aside, am I foreign or not? Should calling the United States Virgin Islands from the United States incur international rates? Should my territorial driver’s license be recognized or revoked in the United States? I get the feeling that we are not supposed to exist. America’s narrative attempts to erase the possibility of the Black, Brown, and White Creole American colonial subject. We are living and breathing contradictions, a challenge to a neatly structured ruling apparatus. The increasing state militarization and violation of our civil liberties already pose a challenge to America’s democratic dogma. This inconsistency is explained away as being a part of the post 9/11 U.S.A. As Anthony Bogues (2010) points out, one can only make this argument if one is ignoring the experiences of Blacks, Native Americans, and other dispossessed people within the American state. An inclusion of our experiences shows that the American democratic dogma has always been inconsistent with the nation’s treatment of the marginalized. Therefore, the U.S.V.I’s colonial positioning highlights the ways in which America’s anti-colonial rhetoric is grounded in white normativity and erasure. **2)** A look at the experiences of marginalized people in the U.S.V.I reveals that American forms of white supremacy and erasure did not die in the post Civil Rights era or with the inauguration of the nation’s first Black president. Instead, this moment in American history is characterized by colorblindness and the myth of US post-racialism (Bonilla Silva 2009). Ahistorical American narratives that overemphasize the ruptures in white supremacy and minimize the continuities of structural racism are prevailing rhetoric. Structural racism remains a significant thread in the socio-political and economic fabric of the country. However, few openly acknowledge that racism exists and many more deny their discursive location in the present schema that continues to privilege whiteness at the expense of non-whiteness, namely blackness. In my conversations, I’m finding that American colorblindness and post racialism is also a major component of St. John’s narrative. To many, “there is no racism,” even though de Albuquerque and McElroy note that the U.S.V.I is a society marked by racial disparities that are acutely felt on St. John. *“Compared to whites, blacks and Hispanics have lower income, educational and occupational status, less home ownership but larger families, and higher unemployment and poverty rates” (De Albuquerque and McElroy 1999: 1).”* Colorblindness, or the refusal to see race on St. John makes it impossible to identify and remedy systemic racism on island. Therefore, it becomes difficult to ask and address a host of questions about racism and colonialism in the Virgin Islands: How does tourism perpetuate racial injustice? Why is gentrification, in its displacement of Black, Brown, and poor bodies, happening on St. John? What is the V.I. National Park’s role in race-based land dispossession? What derogatory stereotypes do people hold about Black, Brown, and White Creole West Indians and how does that set the stage for a continental “White savior?” How does racism and colonialism in the present day function to destroy V.I. culture? The list of questions could go on and on, however, attempts to dismantle racism are often thwarted by the possessive investment in whiteness before they begin. It’s also important to note that the disavowal of racism is not solely an American problem. Latin America and the Caribbean often promotes myths of racial democracy by arguing that our history with miscegenation has created a love for all people despite their race. Carole Boyce Davies (2013) points out that, perhaps, we should focus on learning about all of the ways in which racism functions in our Caribbean spaces instead of arguing that it does not exist simply because we do not have America’s binary, white vs. black racial classification system. The myth of racial democracy is a remnant of European colonialism in Latin America and the Caribbean. We need to understand the continuities and ruptures found in American and European colonial practices so that we can then understand why American colonialism is often viewed as separate from European colonial history.