

Definitions we are working with: 1) “the use of language as a high art; in other words, *how and why* you say something is as important as *what* you say” (Redd and Schuster, p. 41); 2) a certain quality of language, oral and written, where specific cultural meanings and histories are communicated, where certain attitudes toward language itself are central; 3) what gets said in stories, dance, song, paintings, everyday banter and, as such, communicates belief systems, social values, a sense of the past, notions of shared identity, and communal aspirations.

Discourse Strategies and African American Literacies

Strategy	Explanation of Discourse Strategy	Based on your selected text, please explain below: What examples of this discourse strategy did you see/hear/feel in the student’s text? What does this writer hope to achieve with this discourse strategy? For whom? Why?
<i>call-response and field-dependent strategies</i>	Writers become directly involved with their topics (also called direct address) and seem to be speaking to the audience; it is almost as if they are waiting for a response, asking questions, etc.; this is very different from using the traditional academic/school conventions of distance and third person pronouns	
<i>signifyin</i>	Artistic use of indirection; an art of insult where humorous and/or decorous put-downs serve as an indirect form of serious criticism or casual joking (such verbal indirection is also linked to cultural survival as in the African American Spiritual during slavery, “Steal Away” which referenced slave escapes as well as a heavenly home)	
<i>tonal semantics</i>	The sounds of things that get captured through repetition, alliteration, and rhyme in writing (to achieve what talk-singing and intonational stresses capture in speech)	
<i>narrative sequencing</i>	Meandering stories that are narrated right alongside a main story (Narrative sequencing has been one of the most highly discussed aspects of African American children’s discourse styles in elementary classrooms since it often stigmatizes them severely--- often referred to as topic-associated styles which feature “implicitly associated personal anecdotes”)	
<i>directness (related to field-dependence)</i>	Verbal aggression that is regarded as confrontational and, therefore, not objective and distanced enough for academic/school writing; in other words, these writers get all up-in-yo-face (this, by the way, really bothered many of you about Richardson’s writing, suggesting you have internalized schooled literacy MUCH more than you are willing to claim!)	

DeShaun's Essay: Failing

(1) The United States of America has been expanding its territory by invading other countries for many years. Through the process of territorial expansion, the U.S. has claimed that its purpose is to only better those countries, such as Iraq, which it has now taken over. There are many people here in America, along with civilians from other countries, who definitely support what the high powers of the U.S. have been doing over the years. They actually believe that America really wants to improve the welfare and safety of everyone living all across the world. They think that America's main goal is to give every human being freedom. The U.S. government acts as if that lack of freedom is the true reason behind its devastating war with Iraq. However, that is seriously not the case. The truth is that the U.S. only invades countries which it can gain useful resources from, in this case oil. Even more unfortunately, this territorial expansion has only decreased the rate of freedom for everyone living on this earth. Both texts, "The Anglophone Empire" by Amitav Ghosh and "Shooting an Elephant" by George Orwell, reveal the kind of damage that has been done to the world through colonialism and imperialism, a process that the United States is continuing with both innocent Iraqis and Americans alike.

(2) In Amitav Ghosh's text, "The Anglophone Empire" he gave his own personal history of imperialism with the British Empire from an Indian point of view. He does this by revealing that his life has been taken over by the British Empire while he is struggling against it. He compares his history of colonialism with America's current war against Iraq. Ghosh explained how many Americans feel that the U.S. does not need to be invading other countries. He states: "A substantial proportion of America's population remains unconvinced of the need to undertake a new version of a civilizing mission" (p. 2). Many Americans really don't want the U.S. to colonize Iraq because we already have enough problems of our own to deal with.

(3) The U.S. government is so obsessed with colonizing other territories. It's as if the issues which exist in our country do not mean anything. These issues include racial profiling, immigrant harassment, police brutalities, sexually transmitted diseases, tuition increases, mass layoffs, and the environmental problems of pollution. All these issues are being overlooked and ignored by the U.S. government. Then some Americans have the nerve to call Iraq an "evil empire." How can we call someone else evil when we have already taken so many lives in the past? We specifically killed plenty of innocent civilians in Hiroshima during World War II by dropping an atomic bomb on them. Hundreds of thousands of these civilians were either killed, injured, or completely disfigured. Therefore who are we to judge another country and call them an evil empire? Some even believe that God approves of us killing other people. Whenever we kill, it's a virtue. However all these false beliefs are due to the fact that imperialism has brainwashed many people, the colonized and the colonizers. As Ghosh stated: "Empires imprison their rulers as well as their subjects" (2).

(4) There are many Americans who favour the U.S. government because they are manipulated into believing that America is only trying to help out other countries. The U.S. government is so overwhelmed with America's legacy invading other countries that many are also ignorant enough to believe that some of the things the U.S. is doing through imperialism is actually benefitting others. However, it's all wrong because America is not only expanding its territory but it's also expanding white supremacy and oppression. America continues to deprive more and more people of their culture and freedom just like the British did in Amitav Ghosh's life.

(5) While Amitav Ghosh's "The Anglophone Empire" shows the effects of colonialism from the perspective of the colonized (which many Iraqis and Americans can relate to), George Orwell illustrates the effects of colonialism from the perspective of the colonizers in his "Shooting an Elephant." In this story, Orwell simply gave his history of colonialism with Indians. He ends up making a fateful decision near the end of the story. He must decide whether or not he should kill an elephant which has terrorized an Indian village and killed an Indian. He attempts to justify why he finally made his decision to kill the elephant. As a colonizer, Orwell really didn't like his job: "As for the job I was doing, I hated it more bitterly than I can perhaps make clear. In a job like that you see

the dirty work of Empire at close headquarters" (570). Here Orwell is saying that he really doesn't approve of his job, so he's very aware of what he is doing. If he really didn't want to be a colonizer then why in the hell was he there? First of all, he's European. Therefore he most likely had the power of choice. He couldn't go to college or an all-white trade school and still make a decent living? I have to believe that he really enjoyed his job because he chose to be a colonizer; he chose to dominate and invade other territories. No one stuck a gun to his head and threatened him. He knew colonialism was wrong but he did his job anyway.

(6) Orwell then gave a poor excuse for killing the elephant: "I was very glad that the coolie had been killed, it put me legally in the right and it gave me a sufficient pretext for shooting the elephant. I often wondered whether any of the others grasped that I had done it solely to avoid looking a fool?" (576). This ignorant statement just shows that many white people like Orwell feel they have to be on a higher level than someone else of another race. Since he feels superior he can't allow himself to look dumb in front of other people. Orwell feels that just because of his skin colour, he can't afford to be embarrassed. He has this attitude that he's too good to be laughed at because he's the European and has the power of colonialism behind him. He also believes that when he kills the elephant, he's doing the Indians a favor instead of seeing himself as being there only to take over the Indians' territory. He was there to gain something from colonialism just like the American soldiers who are in Iraq to gain oil, not to help the people.

(7) In another essay, "The Geopolitics of War," it was revealed that America's reason for currently invading Iraq was the gain of oil. Many of those U.S. soldiers were very proud of their so-called accomplishments. Therefore, in similarity, I would have to say that Orwell's only purpose in India was to help gain something for Britain, just like America's purpose for invading other countries is about material gain. Orwell is very proud of his job because, again, he believes that he is helping the Indians just as Americans believe they are doing in relation to Iraq. However all they're doing is depriving more and more people of their freedom and cultural history by attempting to make Iraq a more Americanized society. At the same time, they're stealing oil from them because they need the oil for future wars. All these false beliefs come from colonialism and imperialism. The colonizing nation not only controls other people but their own people are told what to do and think by their government. This is why people such as Orwell continue to participate, not because they are necessarily prisoners but because they are manipulated.

(8) Both texts, "The Anglophone Empire" and "Shooting an Elephant," have definitely shown the damage that has been done to the world through colonialism and imperialism. It causes white supremacy and oppression to live on and expand internationally. As a result many have been murdered, slaughtered, and manipulated into believing that the white race is the most superior of them all. Even more unfortunate many people have been stripped of their culture and freedom. All these tragic occurrences are due to the effects of colonialism and imperialism that are not ending, but continuing.

Jamiyla's Essay: Highest Grade

(1) Imperialism and the building of empires are nothing new in this society. It has been a part of American history for years and is still ongoing today. George Orwell, the author of "Shooting an Elephant," presents his arguments against imperialism in a story that shows the struggle one individual experiences under the forces of imperialism. Amitav Ghosh, the author of "The Anglophone Empire" enlightens us with the story of how empire building has changed over time and how imperialism has shaped his life as an Indian. Although Ghosh is Indian and Orwell is British, they both share the same belief that imperialism is bad for both the imperialist and the people.

(2) George Orwell, a subdivisional police officer in Burma, was always mocked and laughed at by the Burmese people. Although many young Buddhist priests were on the street, they never did anything to help Orwell. He felt that Burma was no place for him so the sooner he did his job, the faster he could leave. Secretly he was against the empire and for the Burmese. He states: "I was young and ill-educated and had to think out my problems." This shows that he is doing a job that he neither enjoyed or is mentally prepared for. One day Orwell received a call about a mad elephant terrorizing the people in the town. He didn't exactly know what to do but he wanted to see what was going on. Along the way many Burmese stopped him and told him what the elephant had done. On its path the elephant had destroyed bamboo huts, killed a cow, and even killed an Indian man. Orwell sent for an elephant rifle to protect himself if it was necessary. Thus he says: "I had no intention of shooting the elephant." He doesn't want to shoot the elephant but the Burmese people are standing around and waiting for him to shoot the elephant. Even though he was an officer, he felt like a victim or prisoner at this point and that's when he realized that imperialism was no good for the people or the leaders. You were forced against your beliefs to serve the empire. In the end, Orwell shot the elephant by force of the people. He didn't want them to criticize or make fun of him so he hid behind his imperialist mask and did his job.

(3) Amitav Ghosh, being Indian, experiences the results of imperialism from a totally different perspective. In his piece, he explains the uprising against the British in Kanpur in 1857. Under the Great Indian Mutiny, many British soldiers as well as women and children were slaughtered by loyal Indian soldiers under Nana Shahib. Many Indians were hypnotized by the nihilistic ideas and methods which were so extreme it caused a separation between the Indians. Some Indians chose to join forces with the British while others decided to fight against them or simply remain neutral. After the mutiny the British followed with a plan to bring terror and astonishment to the Indians. Corpses of Indians lined the roads of Kanpur and British soldiers stampeded through the city. The effects of the uprising can still be recognized and it is the reason for the divided regions of Punjab and Bihar.

(4) Clearly Ghosh is suggesting that imperialism has changed from 1857 up to now. He states: "The military power of the United States is so overwhelming that it has caused America's leaders to forget that the imperial project rests on two pillars. Weaponry is only the first while persuasion is the second." This statement illustrates how military power has influenced Americans into believing that the second pillar is not necessary. Back in 1857, when the British were colonizing, they used both pillars hand in hand. After their takeover, the British followed up with the second pillar. They accomplished this by building educational facilities, workshops, and other things to brainwash the Indians into believing they were powerless and inferior. The people suffer by having their independence taken away from them; the colonizers are often challenged by the victims who are strong and smart enough to use the power of the law to overcome imperialism.

(5) In both stories, the events that have taken place prove that imperialism is in fact "evil" for all. Behind imperialism lies a type of racism. This type of racism will continue as long as these powerful Angloempires continue to seek and destroy those nations that don't possess the resources or strength to fight back. These stories showed the downside of the colonizer's position and the colonized under imperialism. The imperial process is all about power and control; whoever has the power will gain the control.