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Analytical Narrative

Every course at BGSU begins in the same fashion. We are asked to introduce ourselves, we are asked to discuss our primary scholarly interests, and we are asked what we plan to do with our degree upon completion. Over the course of my time in the MA program, I have consistently answered the question the same. Within the scope possible for each class, I have consistently devoted my research toward understanding various aspects of authoritarianism, fascism, far-right politics, and anti-democratic processes. As I began taking courses in August of 2021, the January 6th attack on the U.S. Capitol, just eight months prior, was fresh on my mind. This unprecedented moment in our nation’s history rang like a crescendo in my political consciousness. As walls were climbed, nooses were hung, and democracy was attacked, I thought this was the zenith of fascism. What I would come to find out was that that was merely a test for the proliferation of these practices, ideologies, and leaders here at home. As the immediate growth of this ideology is not waning, and as this begins to affect the U.S. and everyone I love, the subject has drawn me towards a strong counteraction. The rise of authoritarianism and the threat of fascism have fueled my curiosity and scholarship. I do not believe one can counteract without first having in-depth knowledge about what one seeks to push against. It is from this perspective that my scholarship began to take shape. Thusly, the four projects integrated into this scholarship reflect my curiosity, passion, and willingness to parse apart authoritarianism, fascism, far-right politics, and anti-democratic processes.

My research comes from a place that seeks to understand how fascism has become so widespread. My main objective has been to begin to build an understanding of the ways policies implemented or reinforced fascist outcomes. I seek to understand the belief systems that encourage the proliferation of far-right ideology, making it palatable for mainstream audiences. I
sought to understand how leaders weaponized rhetoric to mobilize their followers. And finally, I sought to understand how people are affected in various sociopolitical and geopolitical spheres by this malleable ideology. From that reference point, I was able to address my point of focus from various subjects and theoretics including gender and migration, gender and medievalism, Japanese incarceration, and Foucauldian understandings of discourse.

The first paper, entitled “The Neutral Language of Liberalism and The Subjugation That Arises: Biopolitical Analysis of Executive Order 9066” was written for Dr. Jolie Sheffer’s ENG 6750 Japanese American Incarceration course. Through literary analysis, this course enlightened us about subjects involving Japanese incarceration during WWII, the trauma this process caused, the psychic fracture that emerged from dehumanizing removal and detention, and the art that was used to convey the traumas, experiences, and attempts to heal. My paper focused on the executive order that set all the dehumanizing and traumatic experiences, art, and the need to heal in motion. My work focused on how the language within Executive Order (EO) 9066 led to the suspension of civil rights for Japanese Americans via Japanese incarceration, or “internment,” and how such a process has ramifications for minoritized communities in the future. This was an important topic for me because it provided an example of the way supposed democracies could also enact similar forms of governance that are reminiscent of authoritarian regimes, specifically for minoritized communities.

The outcome of this paper was difficult to grapple with. It was the lowest grade I have ever received in an English course in my college career. As I sought to compartmentalize my emotions from the scholarship to edit this paper, I collected comments from five different scholarly reviewers, including three different colleagues, one writing center review, and of course Dr. Sheffer and Dr. Bill Albertini’s feedback. I tried to use all of these to see what I could
do to make the paper coherent and ordered properly, as these were Dr. Sheffer’s main concerns. Dr. Albertini’s main concern lay in the clarity of transhistorical as a concept, and whether the document itself was transhistorical, or EO 9066 was a specific example of racist authoritarianism or functioning within a larger history of racial oppression. With his comments in mind, my revision work in this portfolio shifts my argument away from asserting that the importance of the document lay in the way it existed as a transhistorical document whose implications were far-reaching, *transhistorical* meaning a document that transcends its temporal conception and impact, in this case, one that effects generations beyond Japanese incarceration and the WWII era. This new work then focuses on the liberal aspects of the document which, yes, makes the document transhistorical, but my revised work focuses more on the linguistic presentation of neutrality within the document and the way the supposedly neutral language allows the exertion of its power through biopolitics and biopower. Utilizing a biopolitical lens allows me to theorize about the U.S. government’s ability to form the separated, hyphenated race known as Japanese-Americans. Utilizing notions of biopower allows me to theorize about the U.S. government’s ability to subjugate and control Japanese American bodies. From this, the thesis, and thus the introduction changes completely. In seeking to provide clarity for the dense theoretics the paper employs, specifically seeking to elaborate on the biopolitical frames of Michel Foucault and Joseph Pugliese, my revision work seeks to provide more exposition on the alignment of the assertion of liberalism as a mechanism for enacting racial subjugation through a biopolitical lens. The paper grows from ten pages to twenty due to the expository work I tried to implement. The growth also emerges out of the way I filter EO 9066 through the theoretics of biopolitical analysis and the way neutrality materializes into biopower. By doing this expository and
The second work, entitled “Mothering the Far-Right Nation: Aligning Female Roles Within Medievalism and Fascism,” was written for an ENG 6800 Medievalism course that was originally taught by Dr. Erin Labbie but was assigned to Dr. Rachel Walsh in a week twelve takeover. This hardship actually presented an unexpected opportunity as Dr. Walsh provided two video lectures linking medievalism with far-right politics. This of course directly aligned with my particular scholarly focus. The purpose of the course was to enlighten us on the concept of medievalism. Medievalism as I understand it is the ways medieval imagery, symbols, belief systems, and art influence and exist in our current lives. My research within the medieval framework sought to understand how medieval forms of gender, imagery, family, and race were redeployed for the purposes of far-right politics of female leaders like Marine Le Pen, Giorgia Meloni, and Marjorie Taylor Greene. Although far-right politics are traditionally patriarchal, women have found their agency lies in the gendered roles of guardians and moral gatekeepers of the biological reproduction of a nation. But as I began to do work on all three, my work began to swell into too large a project for my given timeframe. For this reason, I relegated the final iteration to research on Le Pen alone. However, from the perspective of Le Pen, her rhetoric, and the policies she sought to implement, this essay examines how the medieval era has played a pivotal role in the far right’s conception of the nation, family, race, and gender.

Both Dr. Walsh and Dr. Albertini suggested dividing my paper by national contexts/different figures so that I could more carefully analyze, for example, Marine Le Pen’s use of Joan of Arc. Utilizing this feedback, my work in this portfolio articulates what Joan of Arc represents in terms of the far-right politics of France. I also discuss the significance of Joan of
Arc as a woman warrior who functions as an image of both youth and virginity as I suggest white women within the far-right nation are heavily reliant on their roles as gatekeepers of the biological reproduction of a nation. Within the new national context, I assert that Le Pen bolsters her arguments for stricter border policies targeting immigrants as contaminants of ethnic purity as it relates to the national body. Lastly, both Dr. Walsh and Albertini asked me to “braid my claims” more tightly within my introduction.

Using the national contexts/different figures as an organizational base and my main focus, I knew Le Pen would be the easiest to find as her political activity as a candidate was the longest-running of the three. I chose to research her policies and rhetoric because I felt that these would exemplify best the theories I had utilized within the paper, as I expected that they would convey their beliefs on xenophobic exclusion, their nationalist projects, ways to integrate mothering, and focuses on family. However, what occurred in this phase of the process created a new problem. I was now finding trouble aligning Le Pen’s French context with the American context that integrated Greene in an earlier iteration. I fixed this by stating that, although this essay uses Le Pen as a focal point, this work also delves into right-wing ideologies and strategies from various temporal and national vantage points. This then shows how right-wing ideology appears from the same wellspring of belief systems and therefore utilizes similar strategies irrespective of national context. From that perspective, I then began showing that although the national or temporal context varied, there was extensive overlap in belief systems and strategies. Through this new organizational pattern, my work reflects how I begin weaving earlier iterations of this essay within the frame of the national contexts/different figures. As I do this, I try to keep as much medieval theory as possible as I find each theory offers interesting insights into the far-right phenomenon I am speaking about.
The third work, entitled: “Disregarding the Truths of The Madman at Our Own Peril” was written for Dr. Stephannie Gerhart’s 6010 Introduction to English Studies course. This was the first major work I had ever written at BGSU. The purpose of this course was to teach us how to be an efficient and effective grad student. Another focus of the course was meant to help us think about what we wanted to do with our degrees. As such this paper was written in a style that was meant to be conducive to presenting at a conference should we choose to stay in academia. Dr. Gearhart requested that this conference paper should be a rework of a paper we had already written. From that reference point, this paper has existed in many iterations. The first iteration focused on Foucault’s alienated madman to exemplify a persona reflective of Trump voters and Trump himself. Using Dissociative Identity Disorder (DID) as a metaphorical diagnosis of the madman, the paper sought to use the diagnosis, along with explanations of poststructuralist understandings of one's identity, to show how the fracturing of one's identity leaves one vulnerable to authoritarian demagogic tactics while seeking out a form of identical consolidation.

Dr. Gearhart’s main concern for this paper required me to engage more directly with Foucault to make my points/logic clear which would strengthen the essay. For this paper, I worked rigorously to add eleven new pages of expository content that began to engage Foucault in various ways. This work was included to address the recommendations that Dr. Gearhart had made. I then worked to add Foucault’s thoughts on psychiatry as an institution that alienates and subjugates, as DID was the psychiatric diagnosis I was relying on. I added poststructuralist understandings of identity suggesting these tied into the ways an identity could fracture similarly to the fracture that occurs within the patient diagnosed with DID. From the poststructuralist understanding of identity, I was then able to show how one comes to identify with a group, and how one can be alienated through discourse. Dr. Albertini and a colleague identified a point in
my scholarship that suggested that I had not fully explained the connection between the Trump voter’s sense of alienation and my sense that the same type of voter might be understood as suffering from a metaphorical case of DID. These identifications caused me to question my own work deeply. After arriving at that impasse, the work in this portfolio shifts the paper to integrate and focus on Foucault’s understanding of discourse with regard to the madman. This provides a different entryway to assertions of alienation, and deviancy, and the ways an authoritarian can manipulate their followers for their own gain. Instead of relying on the metaphorical diagnosis of DID to speak to psychic fracture, I rely on the notion that madness can be understood as a concept that conjoins madness as a psychological pathology, as a Foucauldian understanding of discursive exclusion and disregard, and as an emotive anger or mad response to Trump’s rhetoric in which Trump weaponizes his voters’ economic and perceived political disenfranchisement which was represented by the destruction of the Capitol. In this work, I assert that the madman is personified by both Trump and Trump voters and that their madness is exhibited in these three conjoining ways. I assert that psychopathological discourse arises as characterizations of Trump and his voters as insane, but also includes those enduring “lives of despair” and consequently “deaths of despair,” which speaks to middle-aged non-Hispanic Whites without a college degree who are prominently associated with alcohol and drug overdose, suicide, and alcohol-related liver disease. The discursive exclusion that formulates the madman occurs on behalf of those represented within the “lives” and “deaths of despair” phenomenon which speaks to the economic disenfranchisement caused largely by policy prioritizing globalization which facilitates the inclination for these populations to turn to drug abuse, alcoholism, and other destructive behaviors to suicide themselves causing life expectancies to drop on a massive scale. I assert that ignoring these individuals leaves them open to demagogic appeals. My work also suggests that
Trump provides an avenue for discursive inclusion by adopting the alienation of the economically disenfranchised while conflating his political and legal alienation with theirs by using phrases like “us,” “we,” “ours” in his speeches. Understanding madness as a discursive position allows me to focus on how Donald Trump uses discourse to conflate his identity with his followers. In this conflation, he is able to mesh his own alienation with his impoverished and politically disaffected followers, and in doing so he is able to present himself as an agent of retribution on their behalf, ridding them of their alienation. This work then offers a way of understanding how Trump, a man of great wealth and privilege, who champions policies that largely benefit the wealthy, to position himself as the champion of people who see themselves as dispossessed, in various ways, by contemporary America.

My fourth project entitled, “Analysis of Refugee and Asylum Seeker’s Migratory Process and Experiences” was written for Dr. Vibha Bhalla’s ETHN 6820 course on gender and migration within the Department of Ethnic Studies. The purpose of the course was to educate us on the various scholarly conversations, methodologies, evolution of language, and concepts that formulated what we know as gender and migration studies. As we pursued this goal, it was made known that an option for our final project could arise in the form of a syllabus. This provided me with a unique opportunity to express what I had learned in the class while devising something that could be representative of my professional goals following graduation. My original syllabus’ focus centered on the various ways displacement can occur including, war, genocide, and climate crisis. This work also sought to convey the ways trauma is incurred and processes of healing may be implemented. As Dr. Bhalla’s comments asked that my main focus be centered around revising or simplifying the course description and adding class objectives to each week, the principal objective of the syllabus shifted. Thusly, the syllabus in this portfolio constructs a
course that interrogates notions, ideologies, and systems that create or designate these communities, peoples, and identities as refugees/asylum-seekers, while they navigate the precarity of these situations. As the readings in the syllabus acknowledge that precarity is inherent to these experiences, the course also seeks to explore new conceptualizations of ways to heal or lessen the traumas experienced through the comparative geopolitical causations and territories.

With Dr. Bhalla’s comments in mind, I began to contemplate what grade level I intended this course to be for. This largely dictates the language of the course description and the readings that I could ask my students to analyze. As I began to contemplate whether the course description, learning outcomes, and weekly assignments worked recursively and coherently, I also began to examine whether my weekly lessons and assignments were thematically coherent, as patterns and experiences within this process are quite complicated. The desire for coherence led me to congeal my themes into three major groups including 1) refugee and asylum-seeking migration 2) ecological migration and climate displacement 3) the trauma of displacement and ways to heal. As the focus of the syllabus evolved due to the recursive process I was engaging in between the course description, learning outcomes, and weekly assignments, the work in this portfolio then reflects how the entire course subject matter shifts away from genocidal wars or authoritarian war-waging and more toward the processes, systems, and ideologies that began to define refugees and asylum-seekers. I did this because I did not feel examinations of processes, systems, and ideologies that designated these precarious identities were a humane enough approach. The syllabus in this portfolio then reflects my desire to prioritize the lens and the voices of refugees and asylum-seekers themselves, so each weekly assignment or objective prioritizes that. As such, my revisions include adding a class objective to every session of class.
This explains how the readings pair with my goals for the week. This is done with the hope of clarifying what the student should be observing and seeking to absorb by the week’s end. As there are sixteen weeks, my revisions take place for each of the thirty-two class sessions. I also rewrote the course description to involve more accessible language but in that rewrite, the focus of the class shifted from a focus on authoritarian or genocidal causes to the processes endured and experiences of refugees and asylum-seekers themselves. In doing so I focus on the process of becoming a refugee or asylum-seeker who is forced to maneuver through various NGOs and nations, the difference between the designation of refugee and asylum-seeker, how organizations designate this status, how one navigates this process, how identity impacts this process, the various causes that create the need to seek out a refugee or asylum-seeker status, the trauma these people endure and the ways they seek to heal and organizations that aid in that process.

This complete alteration of the perspective of the course occurs as I develop how the materials align under this new perspective. There were other minor linguistic clarifications centered around explaining assignments better, but the main conceptual alterations happened within the recursive process between the course description, learning outcomes, and weekly assignments. After meeting with Dr. Albertini, he appreciated the work I had done but suggested that I write an introduction to the syllabus which can serve as a guide or explainer for students and instructors alike. As such I integrate this section before the syllabus begins.

Conclusion

As a result of the rigorous scholarship done on authoritarianism, fascism, far-right politics, and anti-democratic processes, I plan to work for organizations whose main concern is preserving and bettering democratic governments and processes. I also plan to integrate myself into organizations that care about civil rights. Institutions and organizations I have been looking
into include the National Endowment for Democracy, International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, and Amnesty International. I also have an interest in groups that advocate for Latino political activism, as well as companies concerned with misinformation. These interests stem from the ways I see minoritized communities being affected within the democratic process, whether through disenfranchisement or misinformation. One last route I have considered is educating the public about these practices, whether in a classroom setting or through informational advocacy group workshops. Some of the organizations I stumbled upon while doing my research and for that, I am grateful to BGSU for affording me that opportunity. I look forward to representing myself, my scholarship, and BGSU to promote the public good.
The Neutral Language of Liberalism and The Subjugation That Arises:

Biopolitical Analysis of Executive Order 9066

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed

(Declaration of Independence, Congress, 1776)

This statement, as taken from the Declaration of Independence, has been embedded deep within the American consciousness. This self-emancipating statement signifies the birth of American liberalism. The language within the statement suggests the promise of an equal dispersal of unalienable rights and freedoms. The neutral or color-blind language with which the statement is written intimates this equal dispersal of rights and freedoms although we can already see the language exposes an exclusion based on gender. When delving into how such neutral or color-blind language implemented liberalism in the era that spawned it, it is widely known that indigenous and black communities were also excluded from exercising the ironically mentioned “unalienable rights” and precluded these communities from pursuing life, liberty, and happiness.

From these linguistic uses of color-blind liberalism, I see a trend arising. That trend, and thus the main argument of this essay lies in the notion that governmental language that is written in a neutral language (i.e., ostensibly non-racial, non-racist) can be a tool for racial subjugation.

As evidence for my claim, I will be revisiting the language and implementation of Franklin D. Roosevelt’s (FDR) Executive Order 9066 (EO 9066), which according to the
findings of the Congressional Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians (CCWRIC) unjustly incarcerated 120,000 Japanese Americans (JAs). Although EO 9066 is a continuation of American liberalism in that it seeks to *secure* rights, is implemented by a government instituted by men, and derives its powers from consent, the creation and implementation of EO 9066 exists as a painfully definitive moment within the continuum of racial animus towards communities of Asian descent, or more specifically for this work, the anti-Japanese movement. What distinguishes the creation of this order from other liberal projects, and its enforcement, is its immense scale, ethno-racial specific target, and the trauma caused by deracination and the carceral process. This is to say the order crystallizes a moment that represents the height of racially discriminatory impulses against Asian communities in America, although it is a sentiment that has been harbored in this country since its inception. Stanford’s Timeline of Systemic Racism Against Asian American and Pacific Islanders (AAPI) presents evidence of this discriminatory lineage that dates back to the Naturalization Act of 1790, which effectively barred minoritized groups such as Asian American groups from becoming citizens, through to the present.

Just as the Declaration of Independence, the language that composes EO 9066 is written in a neutral fashion, but similar to prior iterations of color-blind liberalism, its implementation shows that language that is meant to suggest it is ostensibly neutral can be a tool for racial subjugation. In this way, liberalism is not only a means of producing freedoms but a way to consume the freedoms of the subjugated to create freedoms for dominant populations. Returning to EO 9066 as an object lesson, we can learn the importance of reading beyond surface language and locating any text within its context, in this case, the context of its racially subjugating implementation. Understanding these contexts can allow us to become vigilant of the ways
orders such as these can enable governmental practices that dehumanize at best and torture at worst.

The notion that suggests EO 9066 violates its presentation of neutrality, and in that, allows state-sanctioned violence to occur is not new. Evidence of this can be found in Lynn Thiesmeyer’s scholarship, “The Discourse of Official Violence,” and Eric L. Muller’s, “There Was Nothing ‘Neutral’ About Executive Order 9066.” Whereas Thiesmeyer uses discourse to interrogate how EO 9066 enabled official or state-sanctioned violence, Muller uses a legal lens to interrogate the order’s supposed neutrality. In drawing from their scholarship which uses discourse or legal frames to understand the supposed neutral linguistic functionality of EO 9066, I mean to interrogate the liberal ideology that permeates the language of the order by applying a Foucauldian biopolitical lens to the interpretation process. In seeking to further understand how the liberal spirit of EO 9066 creates and thus subjugates minoritized communities, I assert that applying a biopolitical framework is crucial to understanding how supposedly democratic or liberal governments form, organize, and control “populations.” Understanding EO 9066’s context within the continuum of America’s liberal project is of the utmost importance as seeking to form minoritized and racialized populations whose freedoms appear far easier and more likely to suspend in the name of security is antithetical to a truly democratic project.

In analyzing the language of the order through this lens, I will explore Foucault’s notion of biopower, or subjugation, derived from his biopolitical conception. By applying the biopolitical frame it is my hope that we can then begin to understand liberalism as a vehicle to implement subjugation. To further highlight the racial, imperialistic, and overtly violent ways EO 9066 materialized its power, I will expand upon Foucault’s biopolitical concept by drawing from Joseph Pugliese’s work, “Geocorpographies of Torture.” In forming this connection, I will begin
to speak about the technologies utilized by EO 9066 to designate specific areas (e.g. internment camps, and other governmentally controlled areas) eligible to suspend and thus thoroughly consume the freedoms and bodies of JAs. By explaining Foucault and Pugliese’s conceptualization of biopolitics and biopower, the next section will be devoted to analyzing EO 9066 through that lens. This will explore not only the language but the implementation of the document as this will prove to confirm that the language itself was instrumental in exacting racially targeted subjugation. Lastly, this work seeks to exemplify the lasting effects of the liberal language and the impacts that it has on generations that had to endure the traumas incurred from it and the ways misunderstanding the neutral language of liberalism can enable future usages of harm against new generations of minoritized communities.

**Foucault’s Biopolitical Lens**

Although I aim to explain the language of EO 9066 and the ways it impacts policy and JA bodies through the lens of biopolitics, it is first imperative to define biopolitics and the biopower it exacts. Foucault, in his series of lectures entitled *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the College De France, 1978-1979*, defined biopolitics as “the attempt…to rationalize the problems, posed to governmental practice by phenomena characteristic of a set of living beings forming a population: health, hygiene, birthrate, life expectancy, race” (317). In his work, *The History of Sexuality*, Foucault explains that biopower emerged from “an explosion of numerous and diverse techniques for achieving the subjugation of bodies and the control of populations” (140). For our understanding of the biopolitical in the context of EO 9066, I would like to highlight its analysis of the governmental practice of forming a population, or in our context the hyphenated status of the JA community. Understanding the ability to form a population or race is important to note as prior to the mass incarceration that resulted from this order, many second-generation JAs were
operating under the notion that they had fully assimilated into American culture. Evidence of this can be seen in Mine Okuba’s *Citizen 13660* and Monia Sone’s *Nisei Daughter*, as both stories speak about the confusion the second-generation experienced as their citizenship was challenged, compromised, and uprooted in ways their white contemporaries never had to face. By understanding the impetus of biopower in terms of EO 9066, my emphasis draws us to biopower’s ability to subjugate and control bodies. Using the concepts of biopolitics and biopower to understand governmental levers such as executive orders, judicial decisions, and military action, we can begin to see how policies such as the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 or EO 9066 begin to form the minoritized “populations” we know as Asian Americans and JAs and the ways these policies subjugate and control them by subjecting them to a race-based hierarchical system of freedoms.

Using Foucault’s biopolitical context, we can begin to think of both the white hegemonic population of WWII and JA freedoms as “something which is constantly produced” (65). This biopolitical process creates a Japanese-American (JA) population reduced to a hyphenated or minoritized status whose position within a hierarchy ensured the consumption of JA freedom while creating a white hegemonic population for which security was produced. This population-creating or racializing process sets into motion an unequal dispersal of security and freedom along racial lines based on white supremacism. As EO 9066 reifies the formation of the hegemon and a minoritized JA community, it disseminates power through a form of liberalism. Foucault expresses that liberalism in itself “is not [the] acceptance of freedom; [rather] it proposes to manufacture it constantly, to arouse it and produce it, with, of course, [the system] of constraints and the problem of cost raised by this population” (65). Viewing EO 9066 through the lens of freedom-producing liberalism, we can view it as a document that arouses, produces, and
constantly manufactures freedom for the white hegemon as it seeks to protect the white national project that is America. Constraints and problems arise from liberalism because, as Foucault notes, it is also “a consumer of freedom” as only “a number of freedoms actually exist” (63). By manufacturing scarcity within the scope of freedoms, EO 9066 sets into place the need for an inequitable consumption of JA freedoms as compared to white populations. To understand the manufactured scarcity of these freedoms, let us explore what they are. Foucault suggests these limited freedoms exist as the “freedom of the market, freedom to buy and sell, the free exercise of property rights, freedom of discussion, possible freedom of expression, and so on” (63).

Understanding what these limited freedoms are via Foucault’s explanation of liberalism, we can see examples of JAs freedom inequitably consumed via biopower’s subjugation in examples such as JA removal posters in which the military stipulated the forfeit of the JA community’s property, their inability to carry anything beyond one item of luggage to campsites, their limited ability to purchase while on campsites, their inability to speak to the general public through the press, and their inability to overtly document their incarceration experience, as any cameras or recording instruments were prohibited. In various ways, these constraints infringed upon their freedom of the market, freedom to buy and sell, freedom to exercise property rights, freedom of discussion, and expression.

Biopower’s subjugating properties, through the governmental practice of liberalism, produce and consume freedom rather than supposing and respecting the belief that freedom is intrinsically bestowed upon a citizen from birth. Foucault suggests that the principle calculating cost of manufacturing freedom is called security. Through liberalism’s desire to manufacture freedom through security it “is forced to determine the precise extent to which and up what point individual interest…constitute[s] a danger for the interest of all” (65). Foucault proclaims that
the nature of liberalism and its “economy of power” is sustained by the interplay of freedom and security. He states that “Liberalism turns into a mechanism continually having to arbitrate between the freedom and security of individuals by reference to this notion of danger” (66) and that “[t]here is no liberalism without a culture of danger” (67). We will see how FDR used the possibility of danger to justify the implementation of military authority to remove and incarcerate hundreds of thousands of JAs. There is a second consequence to this liberalism and its practice and that is “the considerable extension of procedures of control, constraint, and coercion which are something like the counterpart and counterweights of different freedoms” (Foucault 67). The control, constraints, and coercion of EO 9066 are markedly evident as JAs are corralled by the ominous presence of military personnel, the buses and trains they are coerced to board, as imprisonment is ironically the penalty for not complying with succumbing to encampment, and the barbed wire fences that enclose the internment camps themselves.

Understanding Foucault’s definition of liberalism within the context of manufacturing freedom through security by promoting a culture of danger, alongside the examples of constraining practices imposed upon the JAs, I would like to expand on the racial implications of the biopolitical by delving into the concepts of Joseph Pugliese’s work “Geocorpographies of Torture.” By implementing Pugliese’s extension of the understanding of biopolitics, it is my hope that we can begin to see a confluence in the ways bodies are minoritized in geographic spaces governments label as constitutionally immune. As we will see, this can take place as foreign or domestic imperialism.

**Pugliese’s Biopolitical Lens**

Pugliese expands on Foucault’s concept of biopolitics by filtering it through a racial lens. In “Geocorpographies of Torture,” Pugliese’s scholarly attention is focused on the role U.S.
policy played in establishing the grounds for torture at Abu Ghraib. Pugliese coins the term “geocorpographies” to bring into focus the coalescence of violence upon the body within a given space, or the “flesh and blood of the body within the geopolitics of war, race, and empire” (12). These geocorpographies can be understood as geographic spaces governments label as constitutionally immune where dehumanization and torturous environments can be constructed and enacted with impunity. If we map the historical occurrence of Abu Ghraib upon that of JA incarceration, we might begin to understand Abu Ghraib and JA concentration camps are best understood not as distinct acts separated by time and geography, but as overlapping territories of inhumane treatment where the U.S.'s democratic process is suspended. Thusly, a geocorpography in this paper’s context would be the barracks that forced JA community members to sleep on thinly blanketed beds of hay, the latrines that overflowed with feces, or the cramped concealed trains that hauled hundreds of thousands to the camps themselves.

Within this same work, Pugliese is also interested in examining the “codes, conventions, technologies, aesthetics, and visual archives…enable[d] both acts of torture and their visual representation and consumption” (1). From this standpoint, we will see that the rhetoric that sought to impose EO 9066, its enactment, as well as media like JA removal posters or governmental radio announcements served as a code, convention, technology, aesthetic, or visual archive that enables the consumption of JA freedoms through incarceration and its torturous conditions. To understand how any of this can occur, Pugliese asks us to situate “the racial category of whiteness along a number of intersecting axes: as instrumentalizing technology, as mediating prosthetic within the field of vision; as shadow archive actively inflecting relations of power across contemporary media, subjects and institutions; and as racial category that is constitutive of geocorpographies of torture” (1). From this understanding of the biopolitical
functionality of whiteness, I would like to map two conclusions upon our understanding of EO 9066. First, I assert, as Pugliese notes, that just as the torturous actions perpetrated at Abu Ghraib were not the actions of a few deviant or aberrational agents, similarly this was not the case within the implementation of JA incarceration. These acts were instead “the product of the combined political, legislative, and juridical machinery of the U.S. imperial nation-state and its attendant colonial relations of white supremacist power” (2). Second, the prosthetic of white citizenship, or the, “mediating prosthetic within the field of vision” that adopts white supremacist behaviors and viewpoints applies to the white population of the time, but also to certain actors within the Japanese American Citizens League (JACL). As Pugliese notes, “the wielding of power through practices of torture must be seen as securing and reproducing a coercive form of unity of white supremacy that cuts across the actual ethnicities, both white and non-white” (13). This is because, “whiteness must be seen to operate in terms of a transnational technology of racialized power that is simultaneously contingent upon specific sites, subjects, and relations” (Pugliese 13). In the context of JA incarceration, we can see the specific sites as the camps, barracks, and rail cars. We will see that the JACL establish relationships with other JAs as subjugated subjects that reproduce what their white counterparts are doing to gain proximity to power. Applying these frameworks of racialized statehood and locale-specific governmentality, I will attempt to unpack how the supposedly neutral language within EO 9006 creates biopower or the subjugation and control of bodies.

**Supposedly Neutral Language within EO 9066**

As Thiesmeyer and Muller delve into the covert ways governmental language can lack neutrality and incur official violence, I will seek to focus the understanding of these applications through a biopolitical lens. As I seek to describe the biopolitical agency or biopower that is
stunted or emerges as a result of EO 9066, this order should be seen as teetering on the precipice of the interplay between freedom and security. It is my assertion that this order produced freedoms for white populations while consuming freedoms for JA populations through the interplay of the dissemination of freedoms through securitization. FDR’s regime utilizes discourses that produces freedom for white populations while it consumes freedom for JA populations. To understand how language within EO 9066 creates biopower I will first convey what EO 9066 explicitly says. I will then use Foucault’s concept of biopolitics to unpack what this language allows, or its functionality in the scheme of biopower. Finally, I will use Pugliese’s interpretation of biopolitics to show how EO 9066 was a continuation of the production of colonial governmentality to actuate white supremacist power and a means to wield the white prosthetic within a given geopolitical coordinate amongst the JACL.

**Biopolitical Analysis of EO 9066**

The purpose of this section is to place the language of EO 9066 in direct contact with the theoretical notions explained earlier so that one can see how the surface-level projection of liberalism functions as a biopolitical document which creates a minoritized population while exercising the biopower that will subjugate them.

In EO 9066, FDR states his regime’s desire to incorporate a “successful prosecution of war.” He immediately justifies “every possible protection” within this project must be taken “against espionage and against sabotage to national-defense material, national-defense premises, and national-defense utilities.” It is within the statements that create the *justification* for war, with the need to *protect* against potential threats of espionage and sabotage, that we see liberalism’s need to “arbitrate between the freedom and security of individuals by reference to
this notion of danger” (Foucault 66). Here we see the culture of danger that Foucault mentions begin to take shape. This is the production of freedom.

FDR then cites his authority as the head of the executive branch, which combines and defines roles as representative of the public in domestic spheres as well as his role as “Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.” It is within this multi-layered role that he is able to authorize great power to the Secretary of War and other military commanders. In FDR’s willingness to distribute power to these military leaders, again we see the arbitration between freedom and security, but we will also see that distributing these powers does not happen without the knowledge of these leader’s prejudices or how they intend to actuate the power bestowed. Biopower or subjugation is embedded within this language by the fact that FDR knows whom his military leaders will target and how they feel about the populations the biopolitical assembly of power will create.

FDR distributes power by allowing Secretary of War and other military commanders to deem actions “necessary or desirable, to prescribe military areas” in places military commanders determine whether “all persons may be excluded.” Three biopolitical consequences arise from this statement purporting liberalism. Firstly, while trying to provide security to the American public by giving military leaders the power to prescribe military areas using any actions they deem necessary or desirable, the statement bestows to these individuals a broad and concentrated scope of powers that are not accompanied by a form of regulation that would enumerate what could occur if abuse were to take place. Secondly, the prescription of military areas lays the ground work for a geocorpography of torture to exist as this will create a space where the body will be subjected to control within “the geopolitics of war, race, and empire” (Pugliese 12). It is within the realm of force that a military area will be established, and through this liberalism, via
security, the procedures of control, constraint, and coercion” will materialize as “counterweights of different freedoms” (Foucault 67). Lastly, granting military leaders the ability to exclude persons from military areas creates a minoritized population by the fact that white bodies are allowed to enter and move freely along the west coast while JAs are removed and taken to concentration camps. As a result of EO 9066 military posters demanding the removal of “all persons of Japanese Ancestry” are accompanied by posters of Civilian Exclusion Order No. 29. These posters stipulate the forfeit of property, belongings, and free movement. Using a biopolitical lens to read the surface-level expressions of EO 9066 and discerning the ways liberalism is established, it then becomes apparent how biopower or subjugation emerges from the biopolitical concentration and removal of JA bodies.

Through the lens of discourse, Thiesmeyer suggests that although FDR’s order uses official language, it enacts violence through its official language by “concern[ing] itself with the effects of the removal on the majority community, not on the affected minority in itself” (348). She maintains this possible is because the political and legal discourse smuggles in a pervasive bias against the JA community that is “natural” or invisible to the hegemon as securitization is imposed on its behalf. I assert this is how linguistic neutrality is perceived as well. A neutral language that is written by the hegemon in the preservation of the safety of the hegemon would be perceived as natural or invisible to anybody within the hegemon, but as perceived by a JA community member that is adversely affected, this language is anything but neutral. As evidence of this, Thiesmeyer discusses how the language has the opposite effect on the JA community, in that JAs discourse is censored and silenced by not allowing them access to media outlets to convey their experiences and perspectives with regards to removal, confinement, and a possible defense against being accused in the first place.
Here we can see the hallmarks of Foucauldian biopolitics arising in the form of consumption of the freedom by procedures of control through removal, the constraint of movement and discourse, and coercion by means of military threat. This arises from the statement “all person may be excluded” while granting the determinations of this exclusion to Military Commanders. This also harkens back to Foucault’s insistence on the impetus of securitization the liberal state charges itself with. All of this is stated within the context of establishing a culture of danger suggesting the potentiality for espionage and sabotage. All of these neutrally stated concepts, ideologies, and practices create the environment of biopolitics and biopower within the document. Although we can see what the order leads to, it is not what the order explicitly says but whom EO 9066 implicitly enables, what it perpetuates, how it is executed, and what it smuggles in. This occurs in the form of euphemistic, neutral, or official language.

The language within EO 9066 is not overtly racist; in fact, it purposely seeks to appear neutral. The text makes no explicit mention of the protection of, nor discriminatory acts toward, a specific race. The harm is hidden in neutrality. It is through neutrality that the order guises the motives of racist actors such as General DeWitt and Major Bendetsen. Muller’s work shows us that the focal point of a disagreement between “the War Department and the Justice Department over the scope of the President’s delegation to the military of authority to remove people” was based on “the treatment of United States citizens of Japanese Ancestry” (302). After much deliberation, FDR was willing to give the Army the ability to do what it wanted to do despite the fact that DeWitt, the man who would be in charge of its execution, had not hidden his discriminatory language prior to this order. As soon as the order was implemented, DeWitt began designating areas with high amounts of JAs military zones while “ordering the removal of all
people of Japanese ancestry” from these areas (Muller 303). Muller notes that DeWitt’s
motivation was “transparently racist” as DeWitt’s actions were executed on the basis that the
“Japanese race [was] an enemy race’ whose ‘strains’ ran ‘undiluted’ in the blood even of those
born in the United States” (Muller 303).

This confirms Pugliese’s form of biopower in that the racist acts that ensue from EO 9066
are not the product of deviant or aberrational agents but the product of the machinery of an
imperial nation-state. DeWitt’s and Bendetsen’s racism is made further evident by the
scholarship of Roger Daniels in his work The Decision To Relocate The Japanese Americans,
which shows DeWitt and Bendetsen using slurs like “jap” in official spaces and roles, suggesting
that the JA population was only displaying loyalty as “lip service” (qtd. in Daniels 80). The lack
of neutrality is made further evident by Muller’s work which states, “The order gave the military
specific power it had sought to affect the removal of [U.S.] citizens of Japanese ancestry—and
only Japanese ancestry…” (303). Through these private and public displays of language, the
order smuggles in languages that imply racialized versions of the production of security and the
consumption of freedom, codifying these privileges for white populations, thereby excluding and
exacting security-mobilized oppression on JA and their American-dwelling relatives.

Referring back to Theismeyer’s suggestion that the discourse of EO 9066 smuggles in a
pervasive White bias that utilizes a natural or neutral language, so much so that it appears natural
or invisible to white communities, and that the two communities have unequal access to public
means of discourse through the media speaks to Pugliese’s notion of “whiteness as an
instrumentalized technology, prosthetic inflecting relations of power across media, subjects,
institutions.” Frank Abe’s work We Hereby Refuse provides insights into the ways Pugliese’s
conceptualization of the prosthetic of whiteness was made active by the language of EO 9066 as
Abe’s work captures the discussions between the JACL and government officials (18-20). Through these conversations, we see Nisei within the JACL sought to consolidate power for themselves. Not only does the JACL represent the utilization of the white prosthetic as they secured and reproduced a coercive form of unity of white supremacy that cut across an ethnic line, they also participate in the creation of geocorpographies, in that they aided in creating a territory of inhumane treatment where the democratic process is suspended. These territories include the rail cars used to evacuate incarcerees where they were forced to keep the shades down so they wouldn't have knowledge as to their whereabouts (kidnapping) as well as shield observers of the rail cars from guilt, and the entirety of the concentration camps, where they aided in subjecting the community to unequal food and living conditions. A certain population of Asian men also participate in geopolitical corporeal violence, specifically rape at the latrines, as detailed by the Campu podcast in their fifth episode entitled “Latrines.” Liberalism in its pursuit of perpetual peace must paradoxically use violence against JA in a propagandized peaceful manner. This is secondary to its aim to create peace for the hegemonic white population that composes its majority. Those who are to be protected are a part of the hegemonic default, white populations.

### The Impact of Misunderstanding EO 9066’s Neutrality

Undertaking a surface-level reading of EO 9066 has grave implications for current and future generations. History does not die. EO 9066’s impact is not segmented nor isolated. The spirit of this order persists in the form of precedence. The impact of EO 9006 can be felt today. As Jolie Sheffer notes in her work, “Interracial Solidarity and Epistolary Form in Precarious Times,” the order’s legacy constantly resurfaces within public, political, presidential, and judicial discourses regarding “minority rights and [their] privileges in the United States” (55). She makes us aware
of the fact that whether the order is cited by former president Donald Trump with his desire to form a “Muslim ban,” or its essence is litigated in cases such as *Korematsu v. United States* or *Trump v. Hawaii*, or debated by Justice Sonya Sotomayor or Chief Justice John Roberts through court statements, its existence haunts the democratic process. EO 9066 is not a relic of the past affecting one ethnic group or stemming from one wartime event that ends when incarceration camps are closed down. EO 9066 impacted JAs during the WWII evacuation process, incarceration, post-resettlement, and redress. This is a process that would take place over a span of thirty-eight years. The genealogical impacts of the trauma are engrained upon the minds, bodies, hearts, and memories of the JA community as is made evident by the literary works of Janice Mirikitani, David Mura, Brandon Shimoda, Julie Otsuka, etc. Each of these works deals with the trauma of removal, redress, psychic fracture, battles with conformity, subversion, and ways to heal.

Don T. Nakanishi draws our attention to a statement in a conference program from a “Future of Nikkei Community” gathering in 1992, stating, “…there is an obligation to look back and understand the importance of our ancestor’s experiences on our heritage. However, we must also realize that there is a need to go beyond this now familiar history, and take a hard look at where we are now, as Sansei and Yonsei of America. History lies not only behind, but ahead, and the role we choose to take is upon us.” Going beyond we see the relevance in the multiracial solidarity of oppressive states mentioned in Mirikitani’s *Out of the Dust* (2014) or Mura in poems like “Love Poem for Suheir Hamad” (83). EO 9066 should be on the minds of present or future American citizenry when the government starts to utilize language that targets a minoritized group for exclusion, mass incarceration, or oppression in any form with rhetoric
invoking policies on the basis of preserving national security. Trump’s rhetoric is the latest iteration of this continuum.

**Conclusion**

Through the theoretical lens of biopolitics, I attempted to demonstrate how the supposedly neutral language of EO 9066 enacts the sort of liberalism that both consumes and produces freedom through its presumptive responsibility of maintaining national security compromising the democratic process for minoritized populations. Through this lens, with the liberal state understanding its responsibility to maintain peace, we can then begin to understand why the state must utilize supposedly neutral language to justify and signal the production of peace and civility for white populations, while linguistically stunting the racially violent consumption of JA freedoms. It is these minoritized populations, who are indeed part of the nation, that are deemed and reduced to a dangerous status and legally excluded from normative forms of citizenry. These populations inherit the perpetuity of a hyphenated status and all the potential danger that can arise from this social status. As noted by Thiesmeyer, Sheffer, Mirikitani, and Mura, there is a multiracial and international solidarity and concern that arises from EO 9066. Especially as leaders like Trump provide mainstream avenues for white supremacism by utilizing anti-Asian, Mexican, or Muslim language to invoke and coalesce White supremacists, it becomes imperative to understand the levers, frameworks, and ideologies that lend the United States to anti-democratic abuses. Through the creation of documents such as EO 9066, there is a history of America using democracy as a rhetorical term rather than a principle to be executed. As America embarks on such practices, it becomes vulnerable to the rhetorics of authoritarians and authoritarian governments which suggest that there is no differentiation between methods of authoritarian or democratic forms of governmentality. This argument blurs the ideological lines
suggesting that democratic nations should abandon their ethos and succumb to the authoritarian rule they already practice in principle.
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Mothering the Far-Right Nation:
Aligning Female Roles Within Medievalism and Fascism

According to the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA), an organization whose major concern is advancing democracy worldwide, the world is becoming more authoritarian. As International IDEA conveys, “Over a quarter of the world’s population now live under democratically backsliding governments, including some of the world’s largest democracies, such as Brazil, India, and three EU members- Hungary, Poland, and Slovenia” (Idea Global State of Democracy Report). Based on this information, as well as the “democratic backsliding” exemplified by the extreme violence that took place at U.S. Capitol on January 6th, 2021, one can begin to grasp the sense of how widespread and immediately perilous this issue is. With the prevalence of this ideology in mind, this paper is particularly concerned with the roles of White-women leaders within far-right movements. My research seeks to understand how medieval forms of gender, imagery, family, and race are redeployed by female leaders of the far right such as France’s Marine Le Pen. From the perspective of this particular female leader, her rhetoric, and the policies she sought to implement, this work examines how the medieval era has played a pivotal role in the far right’s conception of the nation, gender, family, and race. Although far-right politics are traditionally patriarchal, White women within these movements have found their agency lies in the gendered roles of guardians and moral gatekeepers of the biological reproduction of a nation. As such discussions will be centered around the use of Joan of Arc as a White, Christian, virginal, female symbol of French nationalism, transitions from familial forms of governance to the state, which lend themselves to patriarchal fascist views of the state holding White women as biological producers of the far-right state, and the era’s conceptual crystallization of binarism and exclusivity that allow for
race-thinking that utilizes the xenophobic rhetoric of *othering* in current forms of far-right politics. Using Yuval-Davis’ scholarship to understand gender’s role in nation-building we see how mothering has played a significant role in far-right nationalist politics of the past and how this has materialized as a foundational policy for current far-right female leaders. Through these gender-confining roles within the nation-building process, far-right women seek agency within the historically patriarchal perspectives of the far-right rather than seeking to break down oppressive concepts altogether. My research then engages in analyzing how medieval forms of gender, imagery, family, and race are redeployed by France’s Marine Le Pen through her speeches, policies, public appearances, and the rhetoric she employs. Although this essay uses Le Pen as a focal point, this work also delves into right-wing ideologies and strategies from various temporal and national vantage points, but as we will see, right-wing ideology appears from the same wellspring of belief systems and therefore utilizes similar strategies irrespective of national context.

In seeking to analyze this issue, this work first focuses on the gendered aspects of the far right by showing that Le Pen casts herself as a maternal figure who exists as a guardian of the gateway to citizenship whose duty it is to protect the purity of France and its women, who are the biological reproducers and bearers of its boundaries, from the “contaminants” of globalization. Secondly, this work seeks to understand how Le Pen borrows from medieval narratives, texts, and imagery, and how these narratives/images/texts have specifically been redeployed to mobilize male White nationalists. Third, this work will address how medieval gendered family roles persist with strict adherence within the far-right and how this shapes nationalistic thought. Lastly, this work will unveil the racial discourse that comes to define nationalistic discourse within the far right and shows how that can be traced to medievalism.
Female Gender and the Far Right

Normative gender roles play an integral part in reifying medieval narratives, texts, and imagery through far-right contemporary depictions. On May 6th of 2018, in an appearance at the monument of Joan of Arc in Cannes, Le Pen laid a wreath at the monument’s base. During this appearance, Le Pen made it a point to stare solemnly at the monument as a gaggle of reporters released a cacophony of camera snapshots capturing the event. As she addressed the media she expressed her desire to “respect the tradition and come to pay homage to Joan of Arc.” She continued by stating that her visit lay within the context of “a revolt of the people against the policies led by the European Union in economic policies, migration policies.” We see here her rhetoric attempted to reclaim national sovereignty from the bureaucracy of the E.U. Near the end of her visit, she also apologized to the people of Nice, suggesting that it has had to suffer from “very significant migratory pressure.” In this appearance, we see Le Pen employing two rhetorical strategies here. Firstly, she is evoking medieval imagery of the nation’s past to speak to the traditions she suggests she is upholding. Secondly, she has chosen a female-gendered traditional icon to transpose her own identity upon. Andrew B. R. Elliott in his work *Medievalism, Politics and Mass Media: Appropriating the Middle Ages in the Twenty-First Century*, states that Bridgette Bardot, an iconic former actress, model, and singer called Le Pen a “modern Joan of Arc” (qtd. in Elliot 2). Dayla Soffer in her work, "The Use of Collective Memory in The Populist Messaging of Marine Le Pen," suggests that Le Pen “alludes to all the elements of the memory of Joan of Arc” because Le Pen likens herself to the young girl, where “she too hears voices telling her to save the country. She, too, is imploring her troops to follow her into battle” (75). Soffer further suggests that Le Pen “wants the people to see her both as a
successful leader and as a warrior ready to come to France’s rescue in the same way as Joan of Arc rescued the country from the English” (74).

Power dynamics within the far-right traditionally lean on the side of patriarchy, as Jason Stanley conveys in his book *How Fascism Works*. He suggests that all fascist mythic pasts derive from a mythology tied to “an extreme version of the patriarchal family” (Stanley 3). Stanley furthers the notion that far-right states tend to be patriarchal by suggesting “If the demagogue is the father of the nation, then any threat to patriarchal manhood and the traditional family undermines the fascist view of strength” (127). Through this gendered and familial view of the nation, the politics of sexual anxiety can then be utilized. Stanley notes that “[t]he politics of sexual anxiety are particularly effective when traditional male roles, such as that of family provider are already under threat by economic forces” (127). If patriarchy and the patriarchal family serve as the basis for far-right politics, then how do White women fit into the creation of these types of states and how might female leaders like Le Pen be leveraging their own femininity within the far-right political landscape?

Nira Yuval-Davis, in her work *Gender and Nation*, skews our view away from the patriarchal narrative of nation-building by proposing that “[a]s the biological ‘producers’ of children/people, women are also, therefore, ‘bearers of the collective’ within these boundaries” (26). From this gendered perspective, we gather how White women, specifically through the role of their sexual agency and motherhood, assumed as part of their gender, serve as guardians and gateways to citizenship. It is from the gendered role of sexual agency and motherhood that we should begin to understand the way feminization occurs within the far-right. In understanding the over-emphasized role of White women in the far-right as “biological producers” of a nation and as “bearers of the collective” within its boundaries, we can then see how Le Pen evokes
Michelet’s virginal yet rebellious Joan of Arc as one to symbolize both her political persona and the symbol of France. It becomes imperative to protect the chastity of this nation and its women, as they are the biological producer and bearers of its boundaries, from the “contaminants” of globalization. This is her far-right Johannic rebellion.

As we engage with these concepts, one could begin to confuse feminism with the central importance of female roles within far-right politics. Glen Jeansonne, in his work, *Women of the Far Right: The Mother’s Movement of WWII*, makes an important distinction between feminism and the mother’s movement of the right that emerged in the U.S. during WWII, by suggesting that “It is appropriate to think of the mother’s movement as ameliorative rather than as feminist” (7), citing Chafetz and Dworkin to explain that the ameliorative women’s movement “does not challenge the privileged status of males in the society, but only seeks to make more effective the female’s pivotal role as wife and mother” (qtd. in Jeansonne 7). Here we should note the absence of policy and rhetoric concerning female equality put forth by Le Pen. Instead, she is concerned with the exclusion of immigrants and the preservation of an ideal *Frenchness*. Within Jeansonne’s historicization of the movement, he is able to articulate that White women’s activities within the business, political or diplomatic sphere were often confined to being “guardians of morality, with an emphasis on children, the family, the poor and the uneducated” (3). As far-right patriarchal systems charge White women with a morality that conflates the female body with the nation, and the protection and rearing of children, we can begin to see how White women’s roles in upholding nationalistic exclusion function within the far-right. Using this context, we can see that Le Pen seeks to appeal to the morals and values of the French by emphasizing the value of remaining pure and rejecting the idea of allowing “foreigners into the country” (Soffer 72). In addition, Le Pen seeks to associate the notion of unity with France’s
glorious past. (Soffer 72). We can also see moral appeals made by Le Pen’s wish to “imbue herself with the authority and values that Joan of Arc represents, qualities which she has referenced in a speech: “[Joan of Arc] represents all of the values which we ardently defend. Love of country, the spirit of resistance, the independence of France, the thirst for liberty, the defense of identity and the safety of the French, the assembly of the national troops” (qtd in Soffer 74-75). Here Le Pen is the guardian of French morals, values, and identity.

As Shannon McSheffrey details in her work, *Marriage, Sex and Civic Culture in Late Medieval London*, confinement to the roles of wife can be traced back to a medieval woman’s gender-specific value. She states that “women’s value and identity were more closely tied than men’s to martial status, marriageability, and above all, sexual repute” (McSheffrey 164). Within the far-right, there seems to be a retracing and a strict adherence to this medieval value system. Although the gendered roles of wife within the context of the medieval and far-right do not perfectly map onto one another, this does give insight into the ideological alignments of the far-right and medievalism with regard to the hyper-moralization of the female gender and the marital, familial, and sexual confines they should function within. Although Le Pen never mentions sexual repute, the fact that she chooses Joan of Arc as a persona to transpose her own personality onto suggests that the virginal, female symbol of French nationalism is one that seeks to preserve a mythic past of purity, one that transcends the world of globalization and all the “impurities” that lie within it.

The complex weaving of White women’s roles within the far right often harkens back to a mythologized, cultural, temporal, and geopolitical coordinate that paradoxically confines White women to the role of mothers while investing in them a heightened moral and sexual responsibility to be guardians and gatekeepers of citizenship or biological reproducers of a
nation. Although we have discussed to a minor degree how some value systems of the medieval era have persisted, I want to begin to focus on how or why images of this era continue to be redeployed.

**Medieval Imagery, White women, and the Far right**

As noted in the previous section, due to their patriarchal foundations, far-right politics can be seen as inherently conservative and traditional and thus unwilling to shed its limiting formulations about women’s sociological and political roles. With this traditionalism in mind, this section will focus on how medieval images have been redeployed by White women within different far-right movements. Kevin J. Harty notes that “Joan of arc has frequently been appropriated as a symbol of French nationality, identity, and unity, or as a ‘someone to be invoked in film (and elsewhere) to lend legitimacy to various causes in times of war’” (qtd. by Elliot 1). Elliot notes that Le Pen’s attempt at the reclamation of Joan of Arc stems from a remark from Nicolas Sarkozy’s suggestion that “Joan of Arc is France. […] How could we let the extreme right confiscate her for so long?” (1-2). I believe, as Elliot suggests, that Le Pen attempts to extend her party’s appeal (the National Rally, previously the National Front) to mainstream voters by “habitually us[ing] [a] mythical medieval past to disguise their overtly racist and exclusive sentiments under the respectable cloak of an ostensibly inclusive sense of historical belonging” (2). Through uses of icons such as those of Joan of Arc as noted by Elliot or symbols such as those of the Knights Templar cross described by Millar and Costa Lopez in their work “Conspiratorial Medievalism: History and Hyperagency in the Far-Right Knights Templar Security Imaginary,” we see “elements, ideas, events icons, and symbols are increasingly expropriated from the Middle Ages to serve as ideological weapons in the present day” (Elliot 2). But why resort to this rhetorical tool and why does this appeal seem to be
successful? Stanley’s book provides an answer in his chapter entitled “The Mythic Past.” It is here that he notes, “Fascist politics invokes a pure mythic past tragically destroyed. Depending on how the nation is defined, the mythic past may be religiously pure, racially pure, culturally pure, or all of the above” (Stanley 3). Keeping in line with the project of myth-building, Soffer explains Le Pen’s use of this mythic past strategy by saying, “Marine Le Pen has to incarnate the past in the present by evoking collective memory. It is through the prism of the past that all of us can understand the present. This is a strategy Marine Le Pen has been following as she invokes events in French history to forge an image of herself and convey her message to the public through the use of historical archetypes” (Soffer 71). Le Pen herself states, “to remember Joan of Arc is to remind ourselves who we are and where we come from” (qtd. in Elliot 2). Using Stanley’s understanding, we can see that Le Pen’s utilization of Joan of Arc intertwines the mythic past with her desire to retrieve religious, racial, and cultural purity.

Jacques Darras, in his work “A Myth on Trial,” discusses how Jules Michelet, a French historian, reclaimed and reconstructed the mythology of Joan of Arc as we know her in her modern form. From the French Revolution Michelet imbued her with the “spirit of rebellion” (105). We can see this rebellious streak manifest through Le Pen as she invokes a staunch nationalism while “revolting” against what she sees as the bureaucratic overreach of the E.U. Darras suggests that Michelet “confirms Joan’s virginity, [and from this], invokes the fact that she transcends our world” (105). From this virginal evocation, one can see that Le Pen seeks to preserve a mythic past of purity, one that transcends the world of globalization and all the “impurities” that lie within it. A mythic past of purity is a fascist ideal I will discuss later but this is common within far-right politics and certainly replicated here by Le Pen’s Joan of Arc. Lastly, Joan of Arc is a French female warrior, or knight, specifically. This is at the heart of the
redeployment of medievalism and as we will see provides an avenue for White women to function within the patriarchal mobilization of far-right agency. Darras claims that there is “no end to the plasticity of the Johannic myth” and that “the mixture of facts and enigma allows for every possible diversion” (106). This rings true as we see Joan of Arc’s symbolism manipulated for a far-right agenda in this instance, but this also speaks to the way the plasticity of Joan of Arc may take on new meanings for the far right.

**Medieval Gendered Family Roles and Their Strict Adherence within the Far Right**

As we continue to explore how medieval narratives, texts, and imagery are reified within contemporary far-right depictions, I would like to focus on the link between far-right and medieval discourses surrounding family. As we have learned from Stanley, far-right politics relies on a mythology that conjures up an ideal past where an extreme version of a patriarchal family provided supreme stability. Stanley also notes that the demagogue is seen as the father of nation and any threat to his manhood or the “tradition of family undermines the fascist view of strength” (127). In this patriarchal interpretation of a nation, one can view the strength of the nation as lying within maleness. As we have learned from Yuval-Davis, the matriarchal body version of a nation is represented by a woman’s biological ability to reproduce and thus gain access to citizenship. This belief invokes the essentialist view that a woman should embody nourishment and also be the guardian of moral chastity. As White women are asked to be guardians and nourishers of a nation, one can begin to view a nation as a child. The consubstantial multi-gendered identity of a nation begins to make sense if one thinks about the nation in terms of the heteropatriarchal family. From these gendered contexts, family values have often been evoked alongside anti-immigrant rhetoric. An example of this can be seen in Elaine Ganley’s coverage of Le Pen’s 2022 bid for France’s presidency, where Ganley notes that “Le
Pen has projected a nurturing image throughout her campaign, saying she would oversee France as ‘the mother of the family.’ She has focused on the purchasing power of consumers while standing firm on emblematic issues that define the far right, such as immigration, security, national identity and sovereignty” (Le Pen’s Far-Right Vision: Retooling France at Home, Abroad).

Rhys Jones, whose work, “Problems with Medieval Welsh Local Administration,” shows us that the medieval era’s governmentality consisted of a society that “moved from a world which emphasized tribal organization – one in which political ordination and rights of property were mainly defined through membership of a kin group or tribe, real or assumed – to a society in which lordship over all land and over all men was increasingly assumed by state rulers” (135). This process of territorialization in the form of a maenol, although it failed, sought to define a political space by creating rights and jurisdictions within specific areas through an administrative operation. It is from this genealogy of medieval politics that I assert that current iterations of statehood are still infused with this familial or kinship-like constitution. Jones shows that community organization persisting from the origins of actual kinship were transferred to the family and heirs of kings. These ruling families sought to territorialize and tether politicization to a region. It is my assertion that these emerge now as the national birthrights of a citizen. It is within this context that we see women and the biological reproduction of a nation Yuval-Davis speaks of. Yuval-Davis notes that when nationalist and racist ideologies are closely intertwined the only way to enter this sort of national collectivity is to be born into it, as all others are excluded (27). From this arises the potentiality to enact racist immigration policies in which a nation proposes they do not want to “contaminate the bloodline” of a nation with another. To Le Pen's point, they do not want to inject genes into the patriarchal or matriarchal body that would
“change the face” of a nation or its identity. As noted by Soffer, Le Pen “invokes several pivotal moments in history when France was allegedly united. Each example reinforces the idea that ethnic unity has positively impacted the French in the past and will do so in the future” (73). To evoke a narrative of contamination, Le Pen constantly implements anti-immigrant rhetoric and policy such as Le Pen’s controversial pack to stop “uncontrolled immigration” which includes “treating any asylum demands abroad, not in France, and ‘systematically’ expelling migrants without residency papers, among others; and ending automatic citizenship for those born in France to foreign parents” (Ganley). In terms of Le Pen’s rhetoric on ethnic contamination Soffer notes that Le Pen “paints a picture of France being besieged by out-of-control Muslim immigration which is undermining France’s cultural heritage. According to her, one of the main reasons for this situation is multiculturalism, represented by the European Union and French political elites which endorse it. In her view, the influx of immigrants not only undermines France’s culture but is also the source of its economic woes” (71).

This covertly rehearses a eugenicist discourse that Yuval-Davis discusses which seeks to keep the bloodlines of a country pure as noted within James Davis’s book *Who is Black? One Nation’s Definition*, which discusses the “one-drop rule” (qtd. in Yuval-Davis 27), as was also the case with Nazi law which spoke of “pure blood” that could be “contaminated” (Yuval-Davis 27). This brings us to the subject of mothering. Again, referring to Jeansonne’s work, *Women of the Far Right: The Mother’s Movement of WWII*, he provides an evolutionary perspective on the role of White women and their entryway into far-right politics. He notes that “Women and men attributed to women (particularly to mothers) sensitivity and compassion that made them effective agents of change”— change that was made possible by women’s consciousness of “their capacity to lead movements, of the special interests of their gender, and of their identity as
a group oppressed by many of the political and cultural roles that the male-led society expected them to fill” (Jeansonne 3). Le Pen’s rhetoric suggests she is conscious of her gendered capacity as well, but as Le Pen uses mothering and family as a means to mainstream xenophobic attitudes and policy within the frame of the white French imaginary, the maternal and familial spirit is relegated to French nationals, as Le Pen has suggested implementing an “unforgiving stance on immigration [that] would also end the family union policy, under which people fleeing their home countries can reunite with relatives who have settled elsewhere, in this case, France” (Doyle). Here we see that Le Pen’s strategy of appealing to mothering or the family is one that does not equally apply to immigrant populations inhabiting French borders.

We see the employment of a maternal figure similarly arise as Le Pen made efforts to evoke a traditionally nurturing image during her interactions post-speech in Nice. Unlike the WWII era, which Jeansonne notes, women could be seen as socially “tainted” if they engaged in traditionally male-led spheres of business, politics, or diplomacy, Le Pen embodies a new potentiality for far-right politics. But just like her predecessors, she evokes a sentiment that suggests she is a “guardian of morality, with an emphasis on issues that [involve] children, the family, the poor, and the uneducated” (Jeansonne 3). And like her Mothering predecessors, scapegoating “has [become] a way of life” as she similarly attacks liberals, communists, socialists, and neoliberalists by pandering to the natural inclination to understand that the future is an uncertain place full of potentialities that warrant fear (Jeansonne 8).

It should be noted that invoking the familial rhetorically blurs the social concentricities between family units and national collectives. It is from this position that these leaders can begin to conflate or unite the two and suggest an attack on the national family means an attack on a citizen’s immediate family. An attack on one’s immediate family would no doubt rouse one’s
level of protectionism if patriotic appeals fell short. In past iterations, such as Mussolini’s Italy or Hitler’s Germany, the leader was the patriarch of the country. In this current iteration, a matriarch will suffice so long as she calls upon the strength of its countrymen. Current iterations also feminize the nation—a damsel in distress redployed. This distress can arise from a threat to the patriarchy and its ability to produce for the family. This is how migratory influx is tethered to an economic threat, but there is also sexual anxiety tethered to a migratory influx. This is because it could introduce “inferior blood,” as Charles Lindbergh put it (qtd. in Stanley 127), to White women who are the biological reproducers of a nation. In this case, the nation is a bloodline or a family tree that must be protected. It must not be corrupted by the impurities of the Other. Before this paper ends, I would like to address this notion of impurity, the Other, and if we can equate these concepts to racial formulations.

The Racial Discourse of Nationalism within the Far Right

As noted, this last section seeks to examine discourses of race that may be reified within contemporary far-right depictions or borrowings from medieval narratives, texts, and imagery. The AP notes that Le Pen chose to launch her anti-immigrant stance from Nice because it is the site of a diverse population. She states that it has “suffered from very strong pressure from migration that has partly changed the face” of the city. Elliott makes clear Le Pen “explicitly declared that the statue [that of Joan of Arc] stood as a symbol of White French national identity” (2). Le Pen’s use of a female Christian martyr positions herself as someone uniquely powerful, imbued with what Millar and Costa Lopez call “hyperagency” which is the belief that “elite individuals are constituted as causally driving and controlling history” (Millar, Costa Lopez 3). This is within the context of “racialized Christianity” or in this case White Christian nationalism (Millar, Costa Lopez 3). Le Pen’s White Christian nationalism utilizes conspiratorial security
imaginaries that conceive of a threat to the epistemic of racialized Christianity to mobilize a racialized hyperagency that seeks to drive and control history on behalf of White supremacism. Soffer states that “If [Le Pen] can confer religious grandeur to the values and history of the French nation, she can associate her movement with the Crusades conducted in the Middle Ages to liberate the Holy Land from Muslim invaders” (72). Millar and Costa Lopez show that activism can materialize within contemporary Knights Templar movements from the gendered perspective of males but Le Pen shows that her brand of hyperagency can also be utilized from the feminine perspective. Le Pen evokes the sentiment of a White Christianity under threat and in need of governmental defense using Joan of Arc as her entry point into this rhetoric. Using this warrior-like rhetoric Le Pen has been quoted as stating “Deep within my soul I know that eternal France is calling out and waiting for us! . . . I will lead these men and women in service of their homeland! [. . . ] Help me! Follow me!” (qtd. in Soffer 75). In this context, Yuval-Davis notes that Kristeva “sees ethnic nationalism and the cult of origins as a hate reaction triggered by deep crises of national identity” (20). Combining these various contexts, we come to see that the use of Joan of Arc speaks to a desire to establish an ethnic and national identity through the use of medieval imagery as tradition.

As such, far-right leaders like Le Pen suggest immigration poses a threat to this ethnocultural identity. We see this echoed within Le Pens’ veiled remarks about the “changing faces” of a city like Nice that she suggests is enduring coarse economic times due to the diverse population that lives there. Here she appears to be rebuking neoliberalism or capitalistic globalization or at least the multiracial populations the system encourages as it seeks cheap labor. This is similar to the economic anxiety that Hitler’s regime weaponized against the Jewish community. Benjamin provides us with an insight into this strategy of fascism which weaponizes
the anxious expression of fascist sympathizers against a marginalized Other without addressing the legitimate causes of economic despair by noting that fascism “attempts to organize the newly created proletariat masses without affecting the property structure which the masses strive to eliminate. Fascism sees its salvation in giving the masses not their right, but instead a chance to express themselves” (19). From this, we see that economic equality is not sought as a solution. Nor is class consciousness a desire. Power is sought by using “the chance to express” White supremacy as an aesthetic and an agent for power. Exclusion, hate, and racism are espoused as routes to achieve economic stability for White populations alone as her policies prioritize White French inhabitants. Although this can be seen through the religious context of the racialized hyperagency of the conspiratorial imaginaries conjoined to the Knights Templar which conceives of a threat to the epistemic of racialized Christianity, Shortle et. al., convey that this is not an innocuous claim about religious freedom but rather a proclamation that refers to an ethnocultural nationalist ideology seeking to define American identity as exclusively White and Christian (Americans Are Growing More Accepting of Christian Nationalism). Ana Bracic et. al, in their work “Ethnocultural or Generalized? Nationalism And Support for Punitive Immigration Policy,” in the context of the Trump administration’s policy to separate immigrant children from their families, describe ethnocultural forms of nationalism within the American context as, beliefs about religion, ethnicity, and gendered criteria which form “true Americaness.” If we map this “True Americaness” onto “True Frenchness,” we can see that this evokes the notion of a quality or purity of Frenchness which speaks to Yuval-Davis’ scholarship on eugenicist discourse. The history of trying to scientifically govern the quality of a U.S. citizen can be seen through the SCOTUS decision in 1927 which “upheld the constitutionality of Virginia’s…involuntary sterilization law, and such programmes [which] were practiced in some of the Southern states in
the USA formally until the 1970’s” (31). On the subject of sexuality and racial purity, Stanley notes that “Fascist propaganda promotes fear of interbreeding and race mixing…” so we can see that this racial ideology feels intrinsic to far-right politics and policy (127).

To understand how racial animus arises from medievalism, I turn to Shirin Khanmohamadi’s review of Cord J. Whitaker’s study, “Black Metaphors: How Modern Racism Emerged from Medieval Race-Thinking.” In this review, Khanmohamadi suggests Whitaker understands the medieval concept of “strife” to represent “the late medieval impulse towards dynamic binarism—an impulse central to the development of race-thinking” (qtd. in Khanmohamadi 462). Further analysis of medieval texts through a racial lens exists within The Three Kings of Cologne. In this text, it is suggested that “a continuum of inclusivity and exclusivity of blackness as both metaphor and person [exists]” (qtd. in Khanmohamadi, p. 463). This text also functions to set up a “hierarchical Christian world…whose acceptable participants are much reduced…” (qtd. i.n Khanmohamadi 463). From this, we see medieval concepts of race or racism, of inclusivity and exclusivity, persist through linguistic connotations, such as the reporting described by Richard Utz in his work, Medievalism: A Manifesto, which calls the White race to gallantry or chivalry by asking “What will you do to stop these outrages against the White women? Shall these black devils be permitted to assault and almost kill our women and go unpunished?” (qtd. in Utz 54). In this context, nonwhites are barbarians, monstrous, and sinful. But we can see earlier conceptualizations embedded within our modern forms of governance which can be transposed more clearly onto our own rather than the maenol referencing feudalism, as highlighted by Jones earlier. In his work, Racial and Ethno-National Regimes in Liberal Polities, The Spectre of Race: How Discrimination Haunts Western Democracy, Michael Hanchard, traces the “Athenian practice of combining ethnos (naturalized
political membership) with democracy (a set of institutions and practices)” which “can be found in the laws of most prominent democratic societies” (8). He notes that these societies promote a racial and ethnonational hierarchy that provides “the rationalization for the institutionalization of political inequality, based on the premise that racially and ethno-nationally divergent groups could not share the same state” (Hanchard 8).

To speak to Le Pen’s direct utilization of a medieval text, I turn to the detailed quantitative and qualitative analysis of 500 speeches, texts, declarations, and interviews of Jean-Marie and Marine Le Pen conducted by Cécile Alduy and Stéphane Wahnich at Stanford University. As Soffer cites their data, she notes that their findings revealed that Marine Le Pen frequently mentions “la douce France” or “Sweet France,” which is a reference to the *Chanson de Roland*, an epic poem foundational to French national literature, one included as a staple of French curriculum. Souffer contextualizes this work as one that “recounts a battle that occurred in Spain in 778 between Charlemagne and the Saracens and sets the stage for a perpetual struggle between the French and Islam” (72). As the poem depicts Muslims as “treacherous and untrustworthy,” we can then see how Le Pen uses this medieval poem to promote or transposed her modern depictions of Muslims (72). Souffer further explains the usage of the poem as conveying a moral that Le Pen seeks to evoke when they note, “If the French are too naïve or trusting, as Charlemagne was, Muslims will take advantage and destroy French culture and society. The tale also allows supporters of the [National Rally, Rassemblement National, or RN] to identify with the royal guards, cementing a sense of unity and brotherhood within their ranks” (72).

Elizabeth McRae, in her work, *Mothers of Massive Resistance: White Women and the Politics of White Supremacy*, sheds further light on White women within the far-right political
sphere of the segregationist South by making us aware of the fact that “[t]he political languages White segregationist women employed, in particular, their experimentation with a color-blind conservatism in the rural and urban South,” allowed for the suburban implementation of “a new politics that disguised policies supporting racial inequality behind the language of property rights, law and order, good motherhood, and constitutional intent” (10). This can be seen with Le Pen’s citizenship policy that “nominally claims to be open to the idea of accepting immigrants who are capable of integrating into French culture, she simultaneously rejects the assertion by stressing that: ‘You either inherit French nationality or you merit it’ (Souffer 73). Law and order are evoked within Le Pen’s notion of how to attain nationality when she states what constitutes merit within her citizenship policies by stating that French nationality can be achieved by exhibited by presenting a “clean criminal record, a very good command of the national language, a way of life that conforms to our customs and republican values, a faultless education for your children, and respect and love for the country that has welcomed you” (qtd. in Souffer 73).

Within these stipulations, we see Le Pen’s willingness to use racist tropes which suggest immigrants are inherently criminal, inherently stupid or uneducated, and the willingness to racialize an accent.

The mythology of origins first materializes within the Athenian myth of autochthony and the conceptualization of race, which Le Pen speaks about through rhetorical frameworks such as migration policy, religion, and family. It then seems reasonable to postulate that “anti-immigrant” works as a synonym for anti-nonwhite. Race is thus not openly spoken about but instead insinuated through exclusionary cultural frames, such as Le Pen’s immigration policy, religious references, or family values agenda. As the far right has an overtly racist and exclusionary past, it is reasonable to ask whether Le Pen demonizes based on the concept of race or whether the
concept of race migrated to more subtle approaches. As is noted within WWII mother’s movement, far-right White women made their racism and exclusion more digestible to emergent suburban voters through the form of the familial, and we see this similarly occurring within Le Pen’s use of immigration threats as a rhetoric used to guise overtly racist and exclusionary sentiments under the cloak of historical belonging.

**Conclusion**

This work sought to understand how White women such as Marine Le Pen evoke neo-medievalist imagery to mobilize far-right movements and what sort of historicized medieval narratives they are tapping into. As such, I seek to understand how medieval forms of gender, imagery, family, and race are redeployed for the purposes of far-right politics of female leaders like Le Pen. My research on gender finds that although far-right politics are traditionally patriarchal, White women have found their agency lies in the gendered roles of guardians and moral gatekeepers of biological reproduction, and as such mothering plays a significant role. As such mothering should be understood as ameliorative rather than liberating. It is through these gendered confining roles that White women seek agency within the historically patriarchal oppression of the far right rather than seeking to break this oppression down altogether. My research on imagery showed Le Pen used medieval imagery through the religious context all utilized religious rhetoric to mobilize the racialized hyperagency of the conspiratorial imaginaries conjoined to the Knights Templar which conceives of a threat to the epistemic of racialized Christianity, and through this attain the ability to infuse their followers with a sense of ethnocultural nationalist identity. My research on family showed medieval threads of governance originated in kinship, shifted to the failed territorializing *maenol*, and still very much lie in the eugenicist discourse of nation building which utilizes eugenics or policies of purity such as the
“one-drop-rule.” From this standpoint, family values are extended from the immediate unit to the national one which can then utilize codes to signal consubstantial forms of familial/national purity. My research on race showed that racist exclusion is built into this form of governance but Le Pen utilizes the rhetoric of anti-immigration to signal racial exclusion rather than state it overtly. This is in the tradition of WWII’s mother’s movement. Remnants of medieval racism appear through latent linguistic connotations formulated through this period which created binaries, formulated the concept of blackness as metaphor and personhood on the continuum of inclusivity and exclusivity, and created a hierarchy around Christianity. And the work of Hanchard shows that through the legend of autochthony and the creation of the concept of race, hierarchical existences are built into the creation of most democratic nations. In conclusion, these White women although in positions of power and leadership do not entirely abandon the trope of “damsel in distress” but by adhering to a political ideology that is highly conservative or traditional in that its answers lie in a mythologized past, these leaders are primed to redeploy thought processes that extend as far back as medieval times, and why not, if this is the era of kings and queens, where monsters and demons could be expelled by a leader with an omnipotent rule
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Disregarding the Truths of The Madman at Our Own Peril

The madman, understood not as one who is sick but as an established and maintained deviant, as an indispensable cultural function, has become, in Western experience, the man of primitive resemblances. This character, as he is depicted in the novels or plays of the Baroque age, and as he was gradually institutionalized right up to the advent of the nineteenth-century psychiatry, is the man who is alienated in analogy. (Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, 54)

This whole immense discourse of the madman was taken for mere noise, and he was only symbolically allowed to speak, in the theater, where he would step forward, disarmed and reconciled, because there he played the role of truth in a mask. (Foucault, *The Order of Discourse*, 53).

The feverish touch of Foucault’s madman has spread across America, and a vengeful backlash stems from this alienated movement. This was made boldly evident on January 6th, 2021, as a sea of bodies burrowed their way through the windows and doors of the U.S. Capitol. Outside, make-shift gallows were erected as myriads of voices inside and outside the nation’s Capitol shouted “Hang Mike Pence!” The convergence of this crowd upon America’s critical space of power was not a coincidence, nor was it a product of grassroots organization. As noted by the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol, “President Trump had no intention of conceding. As he plotted ways to stay in power, the President summoned a mob for help. At 1:42 a.m., on December 19th, President Trump tweeted: ‘Big protest in D.C. on January 6th. Be there, will be wild!’ (499). It is my assertion that attacks upon democracy, such as the attack of January 6th, are what happens when we disregard the linguistic ploys demagogues use to develop devout followers, and the needs their followers voice, as simply mad. Trump and certain economically marginalized segments of Trump voters reflect serious economic and political problems in America, as noted by the U.S. Census Bureau’s article entitled “Increase in Income Inequality Driven by Real Declines in Income at the
Bottom” (Kollar, Semega). Although Trump, January 6th rioters, and other segments of Trump’s coalition may look mad to an outsider, characterizing them as madmen, outside of rationality, places us at risk of not thinking seriously about the far-right power grabs and their potentiality. If we categorize Trump and his voters as “cooks,” we are ignoring a salient problem. From journalistic, political, social, and psychiatric discourses that assert that Trump and Trump voters are mad, I then use Foucault’s concept of the madman to provide insights into how we may come to take the perceived madness of far-right politics in America more seriously. From that standpoint, this essay then argues that both Trump and his voters indeed personify the Foucauldian madman and that we disregard the truths they reflect at our own peril.

As I seek to detail what the madman is, it behooves us to understand where the madman comes from. In *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, Foucault describes the madman as one who is “an established and maintained deviant, as an indispensable cultural function” and one who is “alienated in analogy” (54). As the madman then embodies an established and maintained deviancy while carrying an air of alienation, the question then arises, how is the deviance maintained and established, and from where does this alienation arise? In “The Order of Discourse” Foucault informs us that “There exists in our society another principle of exclusion, not prohibition but a division and a rejection” (Foucault, *The Order of Discourse*, 53). From this element of exclusion, what is described is a discursive position of omission, not one of silencing. There is a rejection of a rhetorical position, not a prevention of speech itself. Foucault expands on the discursive position of the madman by stating it is one “whose discourse cannot have the same currency as others. His word may be considered null and void, having neither truth nor importance, worthless as evidence of law…” (Foucault, *The Order of Discourse*, 53). I see Trump and Trump voters occupying the discursive position of the madman in various
ways. Although Trump is now seen as the face of the Republican party, he was once excluded and rejected as we shall see later. There is also the fact that as Trump sought to stay in office, he views his departure from the presidency as a position of alienation from the bully pulpit he once occupied and the power he once held. Although there are conflicting reports as to what economic class Trump voters are, as noted by an NBC survey, we see that “only a third of Trump supporters had household incomes at or below the national median of about $50,000. Another third made $50,000 to $100,000, and another third made $100,000 or more and that was true even when we limited the analysis to only non-Hispanic whites” (Carnes, Lupu). For this work, I am focusing on the third of Trump supporters with incomes at or below the national median of about $50,000, or as Trump called them in his 2017 inaugural speech “Mothers and children trapped in poverty in our inner cities” (Trump, Politico staff). Because this demographic is so important to his movement that it is mentioned in his inaugural address and because he constantly uses this group as a means to engage in the populist rhetoric that could disseminate a power grab, I have chosen to devote my focus here.

In suggesting that the madman personifies both Trump and Trump voters one might wonder how the madness is exhibited. Madness as a concept for this paper conjoins madness as a psychological pathology, as a Foucauldian understanding of discursive exclusion and disregard, and as an emotive anger or mad response to Trump’s rhetoric in which Trump weaponizes his voter’s economic and perceived political disenfranchisement which was represented by the destruction of the Capitol. January 6th, 2021 is a culmination of these three factors.

Psychopathological discourse that characterizes Trump as a madman can be seen within Mary Trump’s book Too Much and Never Enough: How My Family Created the World’s Most Dangerous Man, where she utilizes her skills as a trained psychologist to describe the origins of
Trump’s supposed psychopathology to the nation. This can also be seen within former Justice Department official, Neal Katyal’s discourse, who said “former President Donald Trump's written response to the House Capitol-riot panel's intention to subpoena him looks like an insanity defense” (Teh). This is an interesting insinuation as it would appear Trump is aware of the madness perceived within himself and would thus use it to escape legal trouble. This occurs similarly with within the case of Oklahoma Army veteran, Benjamen Burlew who sought to use an insanity defense against the charges of assaulting a photographer during the U.S. Capitol riot of January 6\textsuperscript{th} (Thomas). Here psychopathological discourse surrounding a Trump follower can also be seen. The most legitimate case for including psychopathology into the discourse surrounding the madman includes those enduring “lives of despair” and consequently “deaths of despair,” which speaks to “middle-aged non-Hispanic Whites without a college degree” who are “prominently associated with alcohol and drug overdose, suicide, and alcohol-related liver disease” (Na et al. 1123).

The discursive exclusion that formulates the madman occurs on behalf of those represented within the “lives” and “deaths of despair” phenomenon which speaks to the economic disenfranchisement caused largely by policy prioritizing globalization which facilitates the inclination for these populations to turn to drug abuse, alcoholism, and other destructive behaviors to suicide themselves causing life expectancies to drop on a massive scale. Ignoring these individuals leaves them open to demagogic appeals. In disregarding these populations, we do this at our own peril. Discursive exclusion also occurs within the association of Trump voters as those who are uneducated conspiracy theorists who adhere to the cult of a pathological liar, although politically Trump has endured his share of discursive exclusion and disregard. As Trump descended his Trump Tower escalator to announce his presidential candidacy in 2015, he
was largely dismissed, and coverage of his rallies was seen more as a sideshow than serious political discourse. During the Republican primaries he was seen as no match for political stalwarts such as Jeb Bush and Marco Rubio, and given a 1% to win according to a 2015 CNN report (Diaz). Up to the 2016 election, many discounted his chances to beat the seasoned, highly qualified candidate Hillary Clinton, as shown by a 2016 Reuters report which stated “With hours to go before Americans vote, Democrat Hillary Clinton has about a 90 percent chance of defeating Republican Donald Trump in the race for the White House, according to the final Reuters/Ipsos States of the Nation project” (Tamman). As Trump quickly aligned his identity with devout followers, the disregard Trump had experienced from mainstream political discourse became his voters’ and vice versa with Trump and Trump voters taking the disregard personally.

Emotive madness or anger that personifies the madman can be seen in the destruction of the Capitol itself as windows were broken, doors were destroyed and feces were found around the facility. As noted within a fact check report conducted by USA Today, “The Jan. 6 breach left the historic building littered and damaged, with broken glass, debris, pro-Trump gear and flags inside the Capitol after the attack. Participants smeared blood and feces around the building as well” (Link). This indeed appears to be the violent behavior of someone who is extremely angry or someone with psychopathology, as we see an insanity plea invoked by an insurrectionist later on. Madness, for the context of this work, can then be seen to mean subjugation, exclusion, or disregard. I assert Foucault’s understanding of the madman as subjugated, excluded, and disregarded can be exemplified by Trump and Trump voters. One might find it difficult to view Trump, a wealthy and connected man as subjugated. It is important to note that subjugation needs only to be perceived, not empirically proven. It should also be stressed that by conflating
his identity with his economically and politically disaffected voters, Trump is able to assume his voter’s subjugation, exclusion, and disregard.

If one is going to utilize Foucault’s concept of the madman, one needs to understand his views on the origins of the madman’s deviancy and subjugation and how those can be traced back to psychoanalysis. In these terms, one cannot refer to Foucault’s madman without understanding Foucault’s opposition to the institution of psychiatry and its moral hypocrisy. Foucault spoke to this moral hypocrisy in *Scientia Sexualis* where he stated that psychoanalysis was a *science* that “concerned itself with aberrations, perversions, exceptional oddities, pathological abatements, and morbid aggravations” which subordinated those diagnosed as such by devising a morality constructed around the notion of a medical norm (Foucault 593). From this, he saw the institutional construction of “an imaginary of devils destined to be passed on for generations” which “established an entire pornography of the morbid” and by doing so was “dangerous for the whole of society” (Foucault 593). From this we see Foucault explain the construction of an entire population who do not fit into the “scientific” normativity of psychoanalysis as deviant. To speak further about the construction of a scientific moral normativity, Amy Allen in her work “Foucault, Psychoanalysis, and Critique,” describes Foucault as maintaining that “Freud merely reinscribed the power structures characteristic of the asylum (silence, the gaze, moral judgment)” (172). From these statements, we can understand Foucault’s thoughts on psychiatry as an institution that alienates and subjugates. I too acknowledge the fact that psychiatry’s history is riddled with inhumane treatments, unethical practices, pseudoscience, and a proclivity to be autocratic and alienating toward a patient’s wellness and input.
From this understanding, I do not mean to reproduce the attribution of pathologies or perceptions of perversions, and thusly the subjugation and deviancy forced onto any population or individuals, but I assert that we should not disregard the quantitative evidence that confirms psychological pathology within segments of Trump voters. Although Foucault is at best skeptical of psychiatry and at worst anti-psychiatric, quantitative research demonstrates that current economic conditions lend a segment of Trump voters to lead “lives of despair” which cause “deaths of despair.” In disregarding these populations, I suggest that we do this at our own peril as ignoring these individuals leaves them open to demagogic appeals.

**How Trump Aligns Himself with Voters to Personify the Madman**

To understand how Trump aligns himself with his voters to form this conjoined madman, I once again turn to a discursive understanding. I assert that through the rhetorical uses of the pronouns like “we,” “our,” and “us,” Trump conjoins identities by asserting he is an instrument of his voters. As we will see, he also does this by using the phrase, “I am your.” Trump provides an avenue for discursive inclusion by adopting the alienation of the economically disenfranchised while conflating his political and legal alienation with theirs. He has done this in speeches such as his 2017 inaugural speech, within a speech which I will call the “I am Your Retribution” speech, and within a speech following his unprecedented indictment in March of 2023. In the case of Trump’s inaugural speech, Trump uses the pronoun “we” to suggest, “[t]oday we are not merely transferring power from one administration to another, or from one party to another, but we are transferring power from Washington, D.C., and giving it back to you, the people” (Trump, Politico Staff). We can see the obvious use of “we” within this statement, but he aligns himself with the people whom he claims have been alienated and excluded from the discourse of previous presidential administrations, or political elites that work on behalf of their
own interests and not the people themselves. Trump continues in this speech by saying, “We will make America wealthy again. We will make America proud again. We will make America safe again. And yes, together, we will make America great again.” (Trump, Politico Staff). Here again, Trump uses the pronoun “we” but in this instance, he assumes the position of his segment of voters that experience poverty as he says he will “make America wealthy again” although he claims to be a very wealthy and successful business owner. In the case of the “I am Your Retribution” speech, Trump stated at the Conservative Political Action Conference (CPAC), “In 2016, I declared, ‘I am your voice,’…Today, I add: I am your warrior. I am your justice. And for those who have been wronged and betrayed: I am your retribution” (Blake). Here he conjoins with his voters’ identity with the phrase “I am your.” In the case of the speech following his indictment, Trump stated that “Our country is going to hell,” in response to his thirty-four criminal charges. In this, he conflates his own legal peril with the decline of the entire nation.

Trump uses the pronoun “our” when speaking about a legal matter that specifically affects him.

Through Dayla Soffer’s heuristic for understanding populist leaders we can see how these leaders align with their followers. Soffer states that

> Populist parties can be defined as those which have the following characteristics:
> (a) They are led by a charismatic leader; (b) The leader does not represent the people but instead reflects them. She is a direct representative of the people because she is the people; (c) The leader criticizes the existing establishment and institutions; (d) Her message is based upon a story. All of which are found in the messaging of Marine Le Pen. (qtd. in Souffer 70)

Trump is the charismatic leader who reflects the people with rhetoric such as “we,” “our,” “us,” who criticizes the existing establishment and institutions, as is seen in his inaugural speech,
while telling his story of returning to a fantastical age through the phrase, “Make America Great AGAIN.”

Although Trump and a segment of his voters exist within a discourse that categorizes them as psychologically pathological, we should not deny the valid shortcomings that they personify or highlight. Truth can come from the madman. My assertion can be seen through Foucault’s notion that “strange powers not held by any other may be attributed to the madman’s speech: the power of uttering a hidden truth, of seeing in all naivety what the others’ wisdom cannot perceive” (The Order of Discourse, 53). With this sentiment in mind, we can see that Trump tapped into frustrations that establishment Democrats and Republicans could not perceive, or in the slightest refused to address.

Although Trump often engages in pathological lying which can be disregarded as alternative facts, he manages to capture and speak to the needs and desires of those enduring “lives of despair.” As is the case with Le Pen’s brand of populism, “The leader does not represent the people but instead reflects them.” Trump with the use of pronouns like “we,” “our,” and “us,” as noted in his 2017 inaugural speech, makes him a direct representative of the people because Trump is the people through his rhetorical means of identity conflation. Despite Trump’s pathological lying, Trump’s critiques of the establishment and existing institutions are valid and were predicted by Jerzy Wiatr and Heironim Kubiak in 1998 when they sought to compare new and old forms of authoritarianism. In their assessment they noted, “Some disappointed groups…began to perceive democracy not as ‘power of the people, for the people and by the people’ but as power of political elites, by elites and for elites” (qtd. in Wiatr 170). Trump himself spoke to this sentiment in his 2017 inaugural speech when he stated:
Mothers and children trapped in poverty in our inner cities, rusted out factories, scattered like tombstones across the landscape of our nation, an education system flush with cash, but which leaves our young and beautiful students deprived of all knowledge, and the crime, and the gangs, and the drugs that have stolen too many lives and robbed our country of so much unrealized potential. This American carnage stops right here and stops right now. (Trump, Politico staff).

This description fits the concept of “deaths of despair.” “Deaths of despair” refers to the concept introduced by economists Anne Case and Angus Deaton in 2015 which speaks to the “unexpected increase in US mortality rates during the 2000s, reversing a century of unbroken decline” (Na et al. 1123). This phenomenon particularly affected “middle-aged non-Hispanic Whites without a college degree, and was prominently associated with alcohol and drug overdose, suicide, and alcohol-related liver disease” (Na et al. 1123). As Peter Na et al. sought to examine “deaths of despair” utilizing a psychiatric epidemiological lens applied to a larger group, they found that “Those in the despair group were relatively younger, more likely to be White compared to those with the neither group and also less likely to be married or to have private insurance, but more likely to be separated/divorced, unemployed, to have lower income or be covered by Medicaid and half as likely to have a college degree compared to those in the lifetime SUD [substance use disorders] or suicide attempt group and the neither group [neither meaning they were not part of the SUD or suicide attempt group]” (Na et al. 1126). Here we see the “American carnage.”

According to Pew Research’s post-2020 election poll, Ruth Igielnik et al. shed light on the fact that overlap existed between those enduring “lives of despair” and Trump’s voting bloc
he spoke to in his inaugural speech. Their research demonstrated that “Trump did substantially better with those without a college degree than college-educated Hispanic voters (41% vs. 30%)” (Igielnik et al. 5). White voters without a college degree were 64% of Trump’s winning coalition in 2016, and this was nearly identical in 2020, where he won 65% (Igielnik et al. 5). Trump’s support amongst White evangelical Protestants was 77% in 2016 and 84% in 2020 (Igielnik et al. 6). With Trump’s popularity amongst White evangelical Protestants being 77% in 2016 and 84% in 2020, it is important to note that their alienation was documented in a 2017 poll conducted by Public Religion Research Institute (PRRI) which showed that “White evangelicals are more likely to say Christians face a lot of discrimination than they are to say Muslims face a lot of discrimination (57% vs. 44%, respectively). White evangelicals are the only major religious group in which a majority say Christians face a lot of discrimination” (Cox, Jones).

White men without a four-year degree went 66% for Trump, while White women without a four-year degree went 64% for Trump (Igielnik et al. 6). According to Igielnik et al. “Trump garnered the support of 65% of rural voters, including 71% of White rural voters” (13). As noted earlier there are conflicting reports as to what economic class Trump voters are, as noted by an NBC survey that showed “only a third of Trump supporters had household incomes at or below the national median of about $50,000” (Carnes, Lupu). Here we see one-third of Trump voters would fit into the “lives of despair” category and thus feel alienated by a status quo that left them economically disenfranchised and politically disaffected, while the other two-thirds may seek to embrace or even strengthen the alienating status quo.

Foucault suggests that the Enlightenment era gave rise to the liberties and the disciplines that we recognize and adhere to today. These representative regimes, who grew out of the politically dominant bourgeoisie were responsible for establishing and implementing the judicial
framework that codifies the disciplines that we abide by as a liberal democracy. Foucault suggests “The general juridical form that guaranteed a system of rights that were egalitarian in principle was supported by these tiny, everyday, physical mechanisms, by all those systems of micro-power that are essentially non-egalitarian and asymmetrical that we call the disciplines” (Discipline and Punish, 222). From this understanding of rule or the establishment of norms and disciplines as “tiny, everyday, physical mechanisms” within our liberal democracy, set in place by the bourgeois class, or political and economic elites of today, I assert that those living “lives of despair” reject and resent the elites and their norms. And in their rejection have sought out in Trump someone who speaks flagrantly. In this flagrant language, Trump is imbued with a sense of honesty that those within elite circles avoid through political correctness. Political correctness in itself is seen as an alienating disciplinary regime. From that perspective, one can see that this bourgeois subjugation was retraced when Hillary Clinton invoked the phrase “deplorables” when speaking about Trump voters. Trump voters demand to be freed from those disciplinary regimes. They demand power to be taken from the elites and handed to them. Through identity conflation, Trump is able to make indistinguishable his alienation from his voters and theirs from his. Through this, he is able to suggest that he is their retribution, and is their inclusion.

“I Am Your Retribution”

In a speech meant to kick off Trump’s presidential bid for the 2024 election, Trump stated “In 2016, I declared, ‘I am your voice,’ …Today, I add: I am your warrior. I am your justice. And for those who have been wronged and betrayed: I am your retribution.” (qtd. in Blake). This evokes what I have noted as the emotive madness or anger that personifies the madman. Here Trump evokes an almost apocalyptic rhetoric claiming to be his voters’ warrior and justice, which can draw one back to the madness that caused January 6th’s violence. The madman Trump
appeals to the madman Trump voter by becoming the Trump voter, making his alienation indistinguishable from theirs. In this sense, the madness of Trump and Trump voters or their deviance and exclusion become one and the same. Here he conjoins with his voters’ identity with the phrase “I am your.” Trump also conjoins with his voters by stating that their wrongs and betrayals are his. I suggest that this conjoining also means that his perceived betrayals also belong to his voters. This can be seen in such statements as “stop the steal” or “I am your retribution.” Within these phrases, Trump makes his and his voter’s identities indecipherable by suggesting that his election loss means their votes are stolen, and from his loss and their loss, there must be retributive actions.

As Aaron Blake so aptly notes “There is no ‘revenge tour’ or ‘retribution’ without the GOP playing into speculative and often-fanciful ideas about the wrongs supposedly visited on its base — and which accordingly demand such vengeance. And there is no 2024 hopeful better situated to capitalize on that sense of persecution and injustice.” This is what the discursive inclusion of the madman looks like without taking him seriously. Considering what occurred with Trump’s attempt to enact a coup and certainly the successful incitement of an insurrection, Republicans are not taking his statements that he will be retributive seriously. This can be seen within the now-infamous words of one GOP official who stated, “What is the downside for humoring him for this little bit of time?” when it was clear that Trump wouldn’t concede the election and lodged a series of ridiculous claims about voter fraud (Blake). With an indictment as a former president under his belt, one could certainly see Trump making the case that turnabout is fair play. He could begin to weaponize the Department of Justice. From this, he would only need someone willing to choose loyalty to him over the precedent set in place. Such an example can be seen within the evidence found by the January 6th committee in which Trump asked or
probed government officials to do his bidding by stating, “So look. All I want to do is this. I just want to find 11,780 votes, which is one more than we have,” in response to Georgia Secretary of State Brad Raffensperger calling the election for Joe Biden (United States, 263).

It behooves us all to take this madman seriously. Republican politicians should take his authoritarian tendencies seriously. One might say they use Trump for political expediency and that they use him in hopes of corralling power. Trump has shown many times, he does not care for party loyalty, he cares for personal loyalty. In doing so he asks that people surrender to his will, not the will of the country or party. Trump voters who are economically disenfranchised should take him seriously when puts forth legislation that benefits the wealthy whom he is very much a part of. Political and journalistic elites on the left should take Trump’s use of invoking class disparity seriously, as Wiatr’s warnings have come to fruition. As noted by Blake in his Washington Post report, “An early 2022 poll showed that as many as 56 percent of Republicans believed President Biden to be a ‘puppet president’ who was ‘controlled by a group of ‘Deep State’ elites’.” Trump’s fascist rise in America can in part be attributed to appealing to those disappointed groups who begin to perceive democracy not as ‘power of the people, for the people and by the people’ but as the power of political elites, by elites and for elites (Wiatr 170).

Although Trump and a segment of his voters exist within a discourse that categorizes them as psychologically pathological, we should not deny the valid economic disparity and political exclusion that they personify or highlight. Truth can come from the madman. However, in the case of Trump’s populist rhetoric, he weaponizes a truth he never seeks to rectify. Or as Benjamin shows us, fascism “attempts to organize the newly created proletariat masses without affecting the property structure which the masses strive to eliminate. Fascism sees its salvation in giving the masses not their right, but instead, a chance to express themselves” (19). In this
regard, Trump offered a segment of his followers “a chance to express themselves” or the release of anger and frustration on behalf of their alienation by inviting them to storm the Capitol on January 6th through a tweet like “Be there. Will be wild.” But as seen from his tax cuts for the rich, he is not seeking to eliminate or affect the power structure. We should neither disregard the quantitative evidence that confirms psychological pathology within segments of Trump voters that I suggest represent the madman, nor disregard the impact that Trump and Trump voters have on contemporary American politics by virtue of painting them as psychologically pathological or mad.

**Conclusion**

Foucault tells us that the “whole immense discourse of the madman was taken for mere noise, and he was only symbolically allowed to speak, in the theater, where he would step forward, disarmed and reconciled, because there he played the role of truth in a mask” (The Order of Discourse, 53). Trump tells truths in the mask of an unhinged pathological liar. He and his strict followers are taken for mere noise, as conspiracy theorists, or as those who communicate in an uneducated language. But here they have revolted against the mere theatrical stage and forced this performance through the shattered windows and doors of the U.S. Capitol. They are certainly no longer disarmed. If we do not address these truths, these economic hardships which led many to despair, and in their despair desperation, American democracy as we know it will implode. As I have examined the rise of Trump through this phenomenon, I realize the limitations of this research. As I do not anticipate this issue will subside, I can see future research delving into the psychopathology of his more extreme and violent followers. I can also see my research delving into the diverse coalition that Trump has built, as noted previously, this work is speaking about a third of his voters who fall well below a certain income.
I can also see my work focusing on Trump alone. It is my hope that people will take the issue seriously and seek to understand how we are falling prey to something that has yielded such dire results historically and globally.
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Expository Guide to Syllabus

As I seek to explain this syllabus, I would first like to state I see this course existing within a few departments. They include cultural studies, ethnic studies, social environmentalism, political science, and law. This section has been integrated to help guide potential students taking the course and instructors seeking to replicate the course, understand what this syllabus seeks to do. In doing so, I state the course description and learning outcomes as these are referenced throughout the weekly class sessions. This is also done so that direct correlations to weekly objectives can be cross-referenced with more immediacy. As one reads the course description, it should be noted that this course stems from a place that seeks to integrate a humane ethos. As such, not only are the processes and organizations that designate the statuses of refugees and asylum-seekers important, but the voices of refugees and asylum-seekers are prioritized in this course. In that, the learning outcomes also reflect my desire to integrate the balance of educating students on the processes and organizations, with the voices of these vulnerable communities. The course description and learning outcomes are as follows:

COURSE DESCRIPTION
This course explores the construction of refugee and asylum-seeking communities, peoples, and identities and the various needs for seeking this status. In seeking to understand these communities, peoples, and identities, this seminar explores the formation of transnational identities through the lens of gender, sexuality, and generational experiences and how these vary when encountering the legal, governmental, bureaucratic, and psychiatric systems that designate their status. As such, a principal objective for this course is to interrogate notions, ideologies, and systems that create or designate these communities, peoples, and identities as refugees/asylum-seekers, while they navigate the precarity of these situations. As precarity is inherent to these experiences, the course will also explore new conceptualizations of ways to heal or lessen the traumas experienced through the comparative geopolitical causations and territories.

LEARNING OUTCOMES
This class has the following learning outcomes:

1. Discuss how refugee and asylum-seekers identities are constructed and negotiated through encounters with various bureaucratic systems, cultures, and geographical spaces. (L1).
2. Analyze diverse forms of documentation of these experiences via literary narratives, NGO websites, governmental policies, case studies, legal documents, the rhetorics of terminology, as well as multimodal means of dissemination of information. (L2).
3. Articulate general principles that shape refugee/asylum seeker relations or status and their intersections with gender, sexuality, and class in structural contexts of power. (L3).
4. Identify local connections to refugee/asylum-seeker communities. (L4).
5. Understand the ways these communities navigate the system while seeking a means to reduce trauma. (L5).
First, I would like to discuss the ways themes arise and align with the course description and the learning outcomes. The three major focuses or themes exist as 1) Refugee and Asylum-Seeking Migratory Process/Experience 2) Ecological Migration and Climate Displacement 3) The Trauma of Displacement and Ways to Heal, and can be seen atop week 1, week 5, and week 9.

The first theme seeks to introduce the class to concepts and agendas of organizations that designate the status of refugees and asylum-seekers and in this way speak to the process and experiences they must go through to gain access to host countries. Here I ask students to familiarize themselves with the organizations and language that designate this status, differentiate between the characterization of refugees via state departments with scholarship on the experiences of female refugees, seek to understand various country’s policies so they begin to understand how the piecemeal network of organizations within this process can lead to confusion and trauma, and see the how sexuality, gender, and health cause precarity when seeking to flee one’s home country. I chose the example of the Rohingya because there are genocidal elements that arose from a previous focus on far-right or fascist factors. This similarly affects my choice of Syria as a subject, but in the Syrian case, expulsion is caused by a leader, not by a cultural or religious faction. In choosing the readings for week 4, I wanted to highlight communities that are in our own national news and speak to experiences within our own sociopolitical hemisphere.

The prescription of readings and other media formats address the first theme by seeking to highlight the processes, organizations, designations, and experiences. Examples of this include following Filippo Grandi, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees on Twitter, discussing M.I.A.’s music video “Borders,” reading the online article “Who Is a Refugee, a Migrant or an Asylum Seeker?” by Amnesty International, reading and analyzing “Global Trends” by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, reading Mahanam Bhattacharjee Mithun’s “From Hell to High Water: The Life of Rohingya Refugee Women in Bangladesh,” and reading the online article “Burma Genocide” by the U.S. State Department. Through these readings and multimodal interactions (L1), (L2), (L3) are constantly referenced, this is because the readings 1) Discuss how refugee and asylum-seekers identities are constructed and negotiated through encounters with various bureaucratic systems, cultures, and geographical spaces. 2) Analyze diverse forms of documentation of these experiences via literary narratives, NGO websites, governmental policies, case studies, legal documents, the rhetorics of terminology, as well as multimodal means of dissemination of information. 3) Articulate general principles that shape refugee/asylum seeker relations or status and their intersections with gender, sexuality, and class in structural contexts of power. All of this is meant to educate the students on the process and experience of refugees and asylum-seekers. This process is replicated for each major theme.

The second theme, Ecological Migration and Climate Displacement, focuses on discussing the ecological impacts of climate displacement and the various areas/populations it affects, analyzing the legal language of organizations and governments that dictate outcomes for these affected populations, analyzing international standards and state practices implemented within South Asia as a means to understand how government entities propose to handle climate refugees, analyzing the rhetorics of naming a climate or ecological refugee, which explores the
concepts and terminology that affects the lives of those facing ecological displacement and how the language impacts this person’s experience, and finally analyzing humanitarian policy to hold the organizations and governments accountable. From this, I ask my students to discern whether the policies dominate the refugees and asylum-seekers in different ways or whether the refugees and asylum-seekers are a part of the conversations that arrive at solutions. In studying Southeast Asia for these sections, not only am I trying to draw attention to a specific region with a specific problem but draw our attention to the precedent that is being made as ecological displacement may become common across the planet. By highlighting this region, I am also seeking to show that refugees and asylum-seeking occur for various reasons and that it is a global issue, not secluded to one region for one reason.

The third theme, The Trauma of Displacement and Ways to Heal, focuses on listening to first-hand perspectives from refugees and asylum-seekers about what the experience is like, and from this draws an understanding that there is no universal refugee culture, trauma, nor form of aid. I am also asking that the students understand each culture and individual has their own needs. As such I have them listen to a TED talk by Zarlasht Halaimzai on what it's like to be a war refugee. I have students read a book on cultural factors in the diagnosis and treatment of traumatized immigrants. I also have students read Afghanistan Remembers: Gendered Narrations of Violence and Culinary Practices by Parin Dossa. This specific book speaks about community-based healing through a culinary process that seeks to bring a part of home to them. From all of this, I am trying to prioritize the voices of refugees and asylum-seekers themselves and suggest agency lies within their hands with us as allies meant to support them in their own healing processes. That is to say, solutions are community-based, not necessarily from the top down.

To add further support to the students in terms of making themes coherent and as a way to keep each class specifically focused, class objectives are placed throughout to specify what we as a class are expected to problematize. Class objectives are used as a means to state clear directives to establish what we wish to gain from that week, and to concentrate our focus. For example, following Filippo Grandi on Twitter meets the learning outcome (L2) “Analyze diverse forms of documentation of these experiences via literary narratives, NGO websites, governmental policies, case studies, legal documents, the rhetorics of terminology, as well as multimodal means of dissemination of information.” By assigning my students this task I am both meeting the class objective of introducing the class to concepts and agendas foundational to the class but also meeting the second learning outcome (L2), by asking students to analyze the UN High Commissioner for Refugees’ rhetoric, the terminology he uses, the ways in which he seeks to reach audiences, how he represents his organization and their goals. This process is replicated with each class and each assigned form of media engagement for each class.

It is important to me to expound on the real-world applications of this course, to show that this course was not one solely concerned with policy or theory, but one that prioritized the current dire situations of these very real populations. I wanted to integrate as many multimodal aspects as possible and I wanted to explain that these situations are ongoing and fluid. Lastly, I wanted to show them that this class can be understood not only through the rigid prose of policy
but also through the creative lens of art. For all these reasons in week 1 Tuesday’s class, I ask the students to follow Filippo Grandi, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, on Twitter. In this I want students to reflect on the rhetoric used by one of the most influential people regarding this issue and the ways situations remain fluid. In the second portion of the class, I ask students to analyze the artistic, rhetorical, and power implications of musical artist M.I.A.’s music video “Borders.” From this analytical perspective, I will be asking students to entertain questions such as “What narratives are questioned or reinforced? How do the lyrics function to question or reinforce refugee narratives? What messages do the visuals convey? How are bodies used? What is the demographic of the refugees?”

As the students engage in the more artistic sides of the course, I want them to ask themselves, “Are these artistic or public forms of expression a way to heal?” While reflecting upon this question I include artistic or multimodal elements such as reading poet Javier Zamora’s creative and gripping memoir Solito for week 4, watching the informative yet stirring documentary “Climate Refugees” by director Michael P. Nash for week 5, listening to Zarlasht Halaimzai’s inspiring yet painful TED Talk “What It's like to Be a War Refugee” for week 9. As well as the midterm in week 8. The midterm continues in the spirit of real-world application while also continuing in the model of balancing educating students on the processes and organizations that designate the statuses of refugees and asylum-seekers, with the voices of these vulnerable communities. Through this assignment, I ask students to work individually or collaboratively to provide a representation of refugee or migratory cultures in their local communities. As I ask them to take 10 photos of refugee or migratory cultures, I ask for ethical and humane treatment of these cultures by stating that this project does not encourage cultural tourism. I ask that they use this moment to ingratiate themselves. I suggest they check out local nonprofits, community orgs, art, restaurants, religious groups, etc. Ethical treatment is also asked should they involve a community member in their photographs. Through this process it is my hope that students engage with local communities to see that refuge and asylum-seekers are part of our communities, and that their experiences and voices contribute to our communities.

Through this expository writing, I have articulated major themes and thought processes and included reasons for my reading choices that highlight the ways I am seeking to meet the expectations mentioned in the course description and my learning outcomes. Through this, my aim was to make major portions and assignments of this syllabus more transparent by showing the thought process behind my choices.
Analysis of Refugee and Asylum Seeker’s Migratory Process and Experiences
– 4300 Seminar

Instructor: Paul Viafranco

Email: pviafra@bgsu.edu

Office Hours: Wednesday, Thursday 1:00-2:00 PM EST

Zoom Meeting ID: 505 062 5073
https://bgsu-edu.zoom.us/j/5050625073?pwd=R1Z1dDUvcXArQVoweHBFVGdRL1p5QT09

Communication: Have a question? Need to talk?
Email me or post to our Course Question Board in CANVAS. I’ll respond within 48 hours at the latest.

Analysis of Refugee and Asylum Seeker’s Migratory Process and Experiences
– 4300 Seminar
Tuesday/Thursday, 1:30-2:45 PM EST, Shatzel Hall. Rm. 242

COURSE DESCRIPTION
This course explores the construction of refugee and asylum-seeking communities, peoples, and identities and the various needs for seeking this status. In seeking to understand these communities, peoples, and identities, this seminar explores the formation of transnational identities through the lens of gender, sexuality, and generational experiences and how these vary when encountering the legal, governmental, bureaucratic, and psychiatric systems that designate their status. As such, a principal objective for this course is to interrogate notions, ideologies, and systems that create or designate these communities, peoples, and identities as refugees/asylum-seekers, while they navigate the precarity of these situations. As precarity is inherent to these experiences, the course will also explore new conceptualizations of ways to heal or lessen the traumas experienced through the comparative geopolitical causations and territories.

LEARNING OUTCOMES
This class has the following learning outcomes:

6. Discuss how refugee and asylum-seekers identities are constructed and negotiated through encounters with various bureaucratic systems, cultures, and geographical spaces. (L1).
7. Analyze diverse forms of documentation of these experiences via literary narratives, NGO websites, governmental policies, case studies, legal documents, the rhetorics of terminology, as well as multimodal means of dissemination of information. (L2).
8. Articulate general principles that shape refugee/asylum seeker relations or status and their intersections with gender, sexuality, and class in structural contexts of power. (L3).
9. Identify local connections to refugee/asylum-seeker communities. (L4).
10. Understand the ways these communities navigate the system while seeking a means to reduce trauma. (L5).

ATTENDANCE POLICY

Missing three classes without prior notice or reason will result in a grade of NC (No Credit).

This class is very reliant on student participation and discussion, so it’s vital that you show up to contribute. If you’re worried you may exceed this number of absences, please contact me ASAP and we can discuss accommodations :)

If you need to miss class due to illness or some other outlying factor, please be thorough and detailed in your email to me about why (eg: I am feeling ill today and will not be able to make it to class). Not too detailed, though—spare me the itemized list of every food you could recognize in your vomit this morning.

Note for student-athletes/band members: Should you need to miss a class due to a university-sanctioned activity, understand that absence from classes, even if excused, does not relieve you of responsibility for completing required work. In such an event, you should consult with me well before you miss class to make alternative arrangements for completing any work.

REQUIRED MATERIALS

- Regular access to our course Canvas site
- Access to assigned course readings, provided by the instructor/institution’s library
- Access to a digital device with the capability to use Outlook email, Zoom, and Canvas

Assignments

Each of these writing assignments must be submitted to receive a passing grade. More detailed instructions will be given for each activity:

- **Weekly Discussion Boards:** In these 1 pg/single-spaced/500-word responses you’ll identify the main argument(s) the author is putting forth, what’s at stake in the issue, for whom, and when possible, identify when/how authors overlap or diverge in their positions. (10%)
- **Small Presentations:** Each Thursday class two people will be responsible for presenting a secondary reading in relation to that week’s texts. These presentations should be approximately 12-15 minutes in length and should include a brief overview – or “take
away” – from that week’s readings. Presenters will provide scholarship on a secondary reading to add more context for themselves and the class. You should briefly discuss what your secondary reading adds to the conversation, and the questions it raises in relation to the topic at hand. On the week that you present to the class, you are not responsible for turning in a written response. (10%)

- **5-minute Midterm Presentation:** Working individually or collaboratively you will give a midterm presentation. This presentation will focus on what is representative of refugee or migratory culture in your local community. Take 10 photos of refugee or migratory culture in your local community and create a presentation based on these findings. As I do not mean to encourage cultural tourism, use this moment to ingratiate yourself. Check out local nonprofits, community orgs, art, restaurants, religious groups, etc. If you involve a community member in your photographs, be sure to inform them of the project and make sure permission is granted. (25%)

- **Research Proposal and Prospective Annotated Bibliography:** For this project, you will devise a research focus and an initial six sources to begin your annotated bibliography. (10%)

- **7-minute Prospective Presentation on Final Research Project:** For this presentation, you will use a form of visual media (slide, poster, video, etc.) to present your prospective final research project. This will allow us to build a community of ideas. (10%)

- **Research Paper:** This is a 4,000-word paper in a writing style of your choice (ficto-critical, ethnographic, poetic, theoretical, etc) that critically (and potentially creatively) explores a theme related to class materials, and obviously your own intellectual/personal interests, and possible routes to add to the healing process. (35%)

**GRADING SUMMARY**

See our engagement-based grading contract for a full grading summary and discussion of attendance and late work.

Possible grades at the end of the semester are A, B, C, NC, and ATN.

A grade of NC will not be calculated into your GPA, and you will have the opportunity to re-take the class in a subsequent semester with no penalty.

However, it is possible to receive an F in this course. If you should stop attending class for any reason without going through BGSU’s official procedure for dropping the class, you may receive an ATN, which is a failure due to attendance. The grade of ATN will appear on your transcript, and an F will be calculated into your GPA.

**Academic Integrity:** Academic integrity violations—cheating (which involves recirculating prior work), plagiarizing, fabricating, and facilitating academic dishonesty—will result in a failing grade for the assignment and possibly the course. Refer to the student handbook for more concerning BGSU’s policy on academic integrity.

**Grade Appeals:** This course abides by the grade appeal process of this course
Department. If you would like to appeal your grade, please contact the department office.

**CAMPUS WRITING RESOURCES AND CO-CURRICULAR OPPORTUNITIES**

**University Libraries:**
The University Libraries supports the teaching, learning, and research mission of BGSU by advancing scholarship and creativity through collections and user-centered services that connect faculty and students to high quality information resources. For example, University Libraries houses the Collab Lab, which supports cross-disciplinary, collaborative research. For more information, call (419) 372-6943 or visit their website.

**The Learning Commons:**
The Learning Commons provides “one-stop-shop” academic support within the Jerome Library in the areas of Academic Coaching, Supplemental Instruction, Writing Consultations, Math/Stats Tutoring, subject groups, and individual assistance. For more information or to make an appointment, call 419-372-2823 or visit their website.

**TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT**
The Technology Support Center (TSC) provides a central point of contact for faculty, staff, and students for questions, problem reports, service requests, and inquiries for University computer systems and communications technologies at BGSU. Email: tsc@bgsu.edu. Phone: (419) 372-0999.

Students looking for CANVAS support or more in-depth assistance with computer technology for a class project should contact the Student Technology Assistance Center (STAC). Students can get help in person at 122 Jerome Library, by phone (419) 372-9277, or visiting their website.

**DEPARTMENT AND UNIVERSITY POLICIES**

**Student Decorum:**
This course requires ethical and professional conduct, which includes academic integrity, collegiality in class and virtual environments, and professionalism when dealing with the community as part of course activities. In order to promote an inclusive and constructive learning environment, demeaning, marginalizing, and otherwise negative language and behavior will not be tolerated in the classroom. Respect and courtesy toward the instructor, classmates, and classroom guests are expected. Language and behaviors that are disruptive, abusive, or harassing may result in disciplinary action as specified by the Student Code of Conduct.

**Basic Needs Security:**
Any student who has difficulty affording groceries or accessing sufficient food to eat every day, who lacks a safe and stable place to live, and believes this may affect their performance in the course is urged to contact the Office of the Dean of Students for support. Please do not struggle alone; there are resources to assist. Please visit the “Support and Guidance” page to learn more about our emergency assistance programs.

Supporting Inclusion and Diversity:
BGSU is committed to providing a safe learning environment for all students that is free of all forms of discrimination and harassment. Sexual misconduct and relationship violence in any form are antithetical to the university’s mission and core values, violate university policies, and may also violate federal and state law. Faculty members are considered “Mandatory Reporters,” and are required to report incidents of sexual misconduct and relationship violence to the Title IX Coordinator. If you or someone you know has been impacted by sexual harassment, sexual assault, dating or domestic violence, or stalking, please visit the Title IX website to access information about university support, resources, and reporting.

Commitment to Anti-Racism:
We believe that words change worlds and faculty and administration strive to help you understand that words, more broadly, language, is powerful. Language can be used to create positive change, but it can also be used to dominate and oppress. University Writing Program (UWP) administration and faculty commit to working with you and offering you opportunities to develop and succeed as writers. You will enter UWP with prior knowledge, experiences, values, and histories that will influence your writing and language practices. Instructors, including me, want you to know that a “standard English” does not exist. UWP instructors strive to continuously reflect on our own language practices—including examining and confronting our own biases—to understand how these practices impact you, in the classroom and beyond. UWP encourages you to develop your unique voice and identity through projects that build on each other and value discussions about discourse communities, agency, negotiation, and reflection. Please see the UWP website for our full Anti-Racism Statement: https://www.bgsu.edu/arts-and-sciences/english/writing.html.

Student-Veteran Friendly Campus:
BGSU educators recognize student veterans’ rights when entering and exiting the university system. If you are a student veteran or a student currently serving in any branch of the military, please let me know if accommodations need to be made for absences due to drilling or being called to active duty.

Accessibility Services:
If you have a documented disability that requires accommodations to obtain equal access for your learning, please make your needs known to me, preferably during the first week of the semester. Please note that students who request accommodations need to verify their eligibility through the Office of Accessibility Services, 38 College Park Office Building (access@bgsu.edu, phone: 419-372-8495; TTY: 419-372-9455).

**Opportunities for Ohioans with Disabilities**

Opportunities for Ohioans with Disabilities (OOD) is a state agency that helps people reach their vocational goals. College students with disabilities can apply for services now to help them prepare for their future career. There are a variety of services depending on the person’s need including rehab tech, career counseling, and support finding internships. OOD helps students with various types of disabilities including physical disabilities, chronic health conditions, mental health illnesses and learning and sensory disabilities.

BGSU has an OOD employee on site. Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor, Jennifer Murray Cosgrove, is located at 38 College Park Office Building with Accessibility Services. If you have questions or would like to apply for services, you can reach her by email, jcosgro@bgsu.edu or by phone, 419-277-6754.

**Religious Holidays:**

It is the policy of the University to make every reasonable effort to allow students to observe their religious holidays without academic penalty. In such cases, it is the obligation of the student to provide the instructor with reasonable notice of the dates of religious holidays on which he or she will be absent. Should you need to miss a class due to a religious holiday, understand that absence from classes for religious reasons does not relieve you of responsibility for completing required work. In such an event, you should consult with me well before you leave for the holiday to make alternative arrangements for completing any work missed.

**BGSU COVID-19 Response**

**Face Covering Guidance**

With recommended precautions now tied to risk levels based on local health department guidance, BGSU does not require face coverings on its campuses.

BGSU will follow guidance from the Wood County Health Department and Erie County Health Department. Individuals may choose to wear face coverings at any time.

Free KN95 masks are available at the Bowen-Thompson Student Union, Jerome Library, Student Recreation Center and the front desk of all residence halls. If you have questions email health@bgsu.edu.
More details can be found here: https://www.bgsu.edu/covid19.html

**Severe Weather:**
In most cases, BGSU will not close for winter conditions unless the Wood County Sheriff’s Department declares a Level 3 emergency. Closing information will be communicated through BGSU’s AlertBG text system, BGSU e-mail notification, BGSU’s website, and Toledo’s Television stations. (Note: You can sign up for or update your AlertBG settings by signing into MyBGSU and clicking on the AlertBG tab at the top of the page.) However, BGSU encourages you to assume responsibility for your own health and safety. Please notify me if you choose not to attend class due to safety concerns.

**Course Schedule:** Formal notice will be given for any changes to the schedule that need to be made.

Unless otherwise indicated on the schedule, each class meeting will be held Tuesday/Thursday, 1:30-2:45 PM EST, Shatzel Hall. Rm. 242

**Resource for downloading Microsoft Word:** https://www.bgsu.edu/its/students/resources.html

Paul Viafranco

**Course Schedule:** Formal notice will be given for any changes to the schedule that need to be made.

| Analysis of Refugee and Asylum Seeker’s Migratory Process and Experiences – Seminar |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Week 1                                        | Theme: Refugee and Asylum-Seeking Migratory Process/Experience                                           |
| TU                                            |                                                                                                         |
| **Class Objective:** Introduce class concepts, agenda, community building                          |
| **In Class**                                  |                                                                                                         |
| • Intro to Syllabus                           |                                                                                                         |
| • Follow Filippo Grandi on Twitter (The official Twitter account of the UN High commissioner for refugees) (L2). |
| • Discuss M.I.A. music video “Borders” https://youtu.be/r-Nw7HbaeWY_ (L1), (L3), (L5).           |
TH

Class Objective: Familiarize ourselves with the organizations and language that designate this status

In Class

Homework

Focus: Refugees from Genocide in Myanmar (formerly Burma)

SUN
- DB Posts Due by next class

Week 2

TU

Class Objective: Identify any differentiations in the characterization of the Rohingya refugee crisis via the U.S. State Department with scholarship on the experiences of Rohingya women in Bangladesh. (L1), (L2), (L3).

In Class

Focus: Refugees from Genocide in Myanmar (formerly Burma)

- Instructor Seminar Presentation
- Class Discussion
TH

Class Objective: Identify any differentiations in the characterization of the Rohingya refugee crisis via the U.S. State Department with scholarship on the experiences of Rohingya women in Bangladesh. (L1), (L2), (L3).

In class

Focus: Refugees from Genocide Myanmar (formerly Burma)

• Student Presentation
• Class Discussion

Homework

Focus: Refugees from Syrian Crisis

SUN


• DB Posts Due by next class

Week 3 TU

Class Objective:

Explore the UN’s website and the language used to promote aid to Syrian refugees. Seek to understand transnational foreign policy as it relates to Syrian and Iraqi refugees and Turkey.

In class

Focus: Refugees from Syrian Crisis

• Instructor Seminar Presentation
• Class discussion

TH:

Class Objective:
Explore the UN’s website and the language used to promote aid to Syrian refugees. Seek to understand transnational foreign policy as it relates to Syrian and Iraqi refugees and Turkey.

In Class

Focus: Refugees from Syrian Crisis

- Student Presentation
- Class Discussion

Homework

Focus: Refugees in the Americas

SUN


- **DB Posts Due by next class**

---

**Week 4**

TU

Class Objective:

Explore how sexuality, gender, and health cause precarity when seeking asylum along the U.S., Mexican, Guatemalan borders.

In class

Focus: Refugees in the Americas

- Instructor Seminar Presentation
- Class Discussion

---

TH:

Class Objective:

Explore how sexuality, gender, and health cause precarity when seeking asylum along the U.S., Mexican, Guatemalan borders.
### In Class

**Focus: Refugees in the Americas**

- Student Presentation
- Class Discussion

### Homework

**Focus: Overview of Climate Refugees**

**SUN**

- DB Posts Due by next class

### Week 5

**Theme: Ecological migration/ Climate displacement**

**TU**

**Class Objective:**

Discuss the ecological impacts of climate displacement and the various areas/populations it affects.

**In class**

**Focus: Overview of Climate Refugees**

- Instructor Seminar Presentation
- Class discussion

**TH**

**Class Objective:**

Discuss the ecological impacts of climate displacement and the various areas/populations it affects.

**In class**

**Focus: Overview of Climate Refugees**

- Student Presentation
- Class Discussion

### Homework
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus: Analyzing Legal Language toward Southeast Asian Refugees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>DB Posts Due by next class</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Week 6**

**TU**

**Class Objective:**

Analyze international standards and state practices implemented within South Asia as a means to understand how a government entity proposes to handle climate refugees.

**In Class**

**Focus: Analyzing Legal Language toward Southeast Asian Refugees**

• Instructor Seminar Presentation
• Class discussion

**TH**

**Class Objective:**

Analyze international standards and state practices implemented within South Asia as a means to understand how a government entity proposes to handle climate refugees.

**In Class**

**Focus: Analyzing Legal Language toward Southeast Asian Refugees**

• Student Presentation
• Class Discussion

**Homework**

**Focus: Rhetorics of Naming. Climate or Ecological Refugee?**

**SUN**

• **DB Posts Due by next class**
Week 7

TU

Class Objective:
Explore the concepts and terminology that affect the lives of those facing ecological displacement. How does the language impact this person’s experience?

In Class
Focus: Rhetorics of Naming. Climate or Ecological Refugee?
- Instructor Seminar Presentation
- Class discussion

TH

Class Objective:
Explore the concepts and terminology that affects the lives of those facing ecological displacement. How does the language impact this person’s experience?

In Class
Focus: Rhetorics of Naming. Climate or Ecological Refugee?
- Student Presentation
- Class Discussion

Homework
Focus: Humanitarian Policy and Ecological Refugees

SUN
- Compose a five-minute Midterm presentation.
- DB Posts Due by next class
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 8</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TU</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Objective:</strong></td>
<td>Display knowledge that conveys how local refugee or asylum-seeking communities forge their connectivity. How are their identities formed in these spaces? How do the various organizations or communities build on one another? Is there any aid or trauma relief?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Class</strong></td>
<td>Finding a Local Connection to Refugee/Migrant Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Midterm presentations. (L1), (L4), (L5).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TH</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Objective:</strong></td>
<td>How do environmental organizations and their research seek to reduce the traumas incurred by ecological displacement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Class</strong></td>
<td>Finding a Local Connection to Refugee/Migrant Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Midterm presentations. (L1), (L4), (L5).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homework</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus:</strong> Listening, Diagnosing, and Treating Refugee Trauma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ocak, Meryam S., and Ohio Library and Information Network. Trauma and Migration: Cultural Factors in the Diagnosis and Treatment of Traumatized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Week 9**

**Theme: Trauma of displacement/Ways to Heal**

**TU**

**Class Objective:**

To hear first-hand perspectives from a female refugee about what the experience is like. To understand there is no universal refugee culture, trauma, nor form of aid. To understand each culture and individual has their own needs.

**In Class**

Focus: Listening, Diagnosing, and Treating Refugee Trauma

- Instructor Seminar Presentation
- Class discussion

**TH**

**Class Objective:**

To hear a first-hand perspective from female refugee about what the experience is like. To understand there is no universal refugee culture, trauma, nor form of aid. To understand each culture and individual has their own needs.

**In Class**

Focus: Listening, Diagnosing, and Treating Refugee Trauma

- Student Presentation
- Class Discussion

**Homework**

Focus: Listening, Diagnosing and Treating Refugee Trauma

**SUN**

Week 10

TU

Class Objective:
To learn about the Afghani female refugee experience, how their traumas were built, and how they seek to heal using their own culture and food.

In Class

Focus: Listening, Diagnosing, and Treating Refugee Trauma

- Instructor Seminar Presentation
- Class discussion

TH

Class Objective:
To learn about the Afghani female refugee experience, how their traumas were built, and how they seek to heal using their own culture and food.

In Class

Focus: Listening, Diagnosing, and Treating Refugee Trauma

- Student Presentation
- Class Discussion

Homework

Focus: Listening, Diagnosing, and Treating Refugee Trauma

SUN

- DB Posts Due by next class
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 11</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TU</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Objective:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To learn about the mental health effects of forced displacement on children. To provide a different overview of a person within a different developmental state as well as a position of social vulnerability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus: Listening, Diagnosing and Treating Refugee Trauma</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Instructor Seminar Presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Class discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TH</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Objective:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To learn about the mental health effects of forced displacement on children. To provide a different overview of a person within a different developmental state as well as a position of social vulnerability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus: Listening, Diagnosing and Treating Refugee Trauma</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student Presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Class Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homework</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus: Listening and Engaging in Activism to Aid Refugees and their Families</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Watch/ Post: Who is Dayani Cristal? Directed by Marc Silver, performances by Gael Garcia Bernal, Pulse Films, Canana Films, 2013. (L1), (L2), (L3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Begin rough drafting potential themes for research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DB Posts Due by next class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 12</th>
<th>Theme: Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TU</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Objective:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Engage in a class discussion that allows students to share ideas on potential themes. (L1), (L2), (L3), (L4), (L5).

In Class
Focus: Final Research Project

• Discuss potential themes. (L1), (L2), (L3), (L4), (L5).

TH

Class Objective:
Discuss the gender dynamics, nationality, and bureaucratic system, and trauma portrayed in film in relation to secondary research of presenters. (L1), (L2), (L3), (L5).

In Class
Focus: Listening and Engaging in Activism to Aid Refugees and their Families

• Student Presentation
• Class Discussion

Homework
Focus: Final Research Project

SUN

• Research Proposal and Prospective Annotated Bibliography due by 11:59 p.m.

Week 13

TU

Class Objective:
Engage in a class discussion that allows students to share ideas for potential authors or regions of interest that have not been covered in the course. (L1), (L2), (L3), (L4), (L5).

In Class
Focus: Final Research Project

• Discuss author(s). (L1), (L2), (L3), (L5).
• Discuss regions we have not been able to cover (South America, Africa, Europe, Middle East). (L1), (L2), (L3), (L4), (L5).
TH

Class Objective:

Engage in a class discussion that allows students to share ideas for different research lenses and methodologies as many have been explored in class. Discuss which approaches are most effective and why.

In Class

Focus: Final Research Project

• Discuss sources/ methods. (L1), (L2), (L3), (L4), (L5).

Week 14

TU

Class Objective:

Address any issues or concerns with final project. (L1), (L2), (L3), (L4), (L5).

In Class

Focus: Final Research Project

• Conference. (L1), (L2), (L3), (L4), (L5).

TH

Class Objective:

Address any issues or concerns with final project. (L1), (L2), (L3), (L4), (L5).

In Class

Focus: Final Research Project

• Conference. (L1), (L2), (L3), (L4), (L5).

Week 15

TU

Class Objective:

Present prospective research presentation which conveys multiple learning outcomes. (L1), (L2), (L3), (L4), (L5).

In Class
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Week 16</th>
<th>Exam week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TU</td>
<td>Class Objective:</td>
<td>Present prospective research presentation which conveys multiple learning outcomes. (L1), (L2), (L3), (L4), (L5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Class Focus: Final Research Project</td>
<td>Prospective Research Presentation. (L1), (L2), (L3), (L4), (L5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>Class Objective:</td>
<td>Present prospective research presentation which conveys multiple learning outcomes. (L1), (L2), (L3), (L4), (L5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Class Focus: Final Research Project</td>
<td>Prospective Research Presentation. (L1), (L2), (L3), (L4), (L5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Homework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Class Objective:

Turn in final project which conveys multiple learning outcomes. (L1), (L2), (L3), (L4), (L5).

- Final Research Project Due. (L1), (L2), (L3), (L4), (L5).

** This document is subject to change **