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Colonial Body-Logic in George Orwell’s *Burmese Days*: A Contrapuntal Critique

Riley Mays

Introduction

Colonial literature has long been a site of fascination for the Western literary sphere. Rising to critical prominence in the 1930s, the genre bloomed when metropolitan Europe became consumed with questioning the fascist logic levelled by their own countries (Buchanan 1). Situating anti-imperialism during this period finds us in English-occupied India, a principal site of anxiety where the impending decline of empire, threat of racial mixture, and crumbling social and political structures were being negotiated (Rao & Pierce 117).

A prominent example of colonial literature is George Orwell’s 1934 novel, *Burmese Days*. Following Flory, a disillusioned Englishman living in Burma, the novel examines the hypocrisies of British rule and the unrest caused by imperial conquest. The novel’s anti-imperialist stance can largely be identified in Flory, as he openly critiques the British occupation in India throughout the novel: “Of course we keep the peace in India, in our own interest, but what does all this law and order business boil down to? More banks and more prisons—that’s all it means” (*Burmese Days* 33). In his verbal accusations, Flory acts as a conduit for anti-imperialist commentary.

However, despite his criticisms, Flory is unable to confront the other members of the European Club. This hypocrisy, which is ridiculed throughout the text (Flory is often termed “weak” [165] and “a coward”)
[8] for his nonconfrontational tendencies), reveals an additional level of critique of British rule: even those who are against it remain passive, and therefore complicit, in colonization. This was an effect of colonization that particularly irked Orwell, perhaps because he saw it in himself: as a young man, Orwell worked as a police officer in colonial Burma, a post which he apparently abandons to his disgust with the British colonial system. In an essay, “Shooting an Elephant” (1936), Orwell discusses his experience as a police officer: “In a job like that you see the dirty work of Empire at close quarters [...] all these oppressed me with an intolerable sense of guilt. But I could get nothing into perspective. I was young and ill-educated” (1). It is with this perspective and experience that Orwell wrote *Burmese Days*, as a testament to his anti-imperialist sentiments.

Yet, where Orwell’s critique materializes, so does its antithesis. Despite his anti-imperialist stance, Orwell relies on highly-racialized Western tropes of the East to describe Burma, invoking a Same-Other dualism which inevitably muddies the validity of his critique. We may understand this discrepancy through the lens of Edward Said’s *Orientalism*, which illustrates that the fantasy of the ‘Orient,’ or the socially constructed term that is liberally applied to Asian countries east of Europe, is envisioned from the perspective of the ‘Occident’ (the West) within colonial literature. “In quite a constant way,” Said writes, “Orientalism depends for its strategy on this flexible _positional_ superiority, which puts the Westerner in a whole series of possible relationships with the Orient without ever losing him the relative upper hand” (*Orientalism* 7). In anti-imperialist literature, this positionality allows the author to assume a critical position towards colonization while
remaining complicit in its theoretical justification. I am interested in how Orwell’s critique undoes itself through the presentation of bodies—specifically the opposition of colonized/colonizer bodies. Relying on Said’s theoretical framework, I investigate the shortcomings of Orwell’s satire and literary subterfuge and how the staying power of his criticism ultimately reproduces colonial body-logic that imprisons rather than liberates.

**Contrapuntal Theory and Body-Logic**

While colonialist fiction varies greatly in form, effect, and intention, many scholars will agree that this genre relies on and reproduces a Same-Other dualism in which the colonized are configured as the unrecognizable and alien ‘Other’ whilst colonizers are represented as the fixed, omnipresent ‘Same’ (Yancy 3). This dualism can be applied to the concept of the Orient and the Occident. Rather than referring to a material or geographical realm, the Orient and the Other are better understood as ideas that, as Said writes, “have a history and tradition of thought, imagery, and vocabulary that have given it reality and presence in and for the West” (*Orientalism* 13). This process is precisely what Said terms ‘Orientalism,’ or the production of fictions deployed by the West to relegate the Orient in relation to (and ultimately below) the Occident.

To analyze the process of Orientalism, Said deploys contrapuntal theory, a literary methodology that requires engagement with the perspectives of both the colonizer and the colonized (*Orientalism* 59). Deriving from musical terminology, ‘contrapuntal,’ in which two melodic lines are played at the same time, this theory attends to the existence of dual narra-
tives represented in colonialist literature (Shabanirad & Miranda 26). In the counterpoint of Western classical music, Said argues, various themes “play off one another” without necessarily privileging one over the other, yet in the “resulting polyphony there is concert and order, an organized interplay that derives from the themes” (Culture and Imperialism 51). In the same light, we may read and interpret Western colonial fiction. This definition is critical to our analysis because it encourages us to acknowledge dual perspectives, excavate biases, confront historical context, and more specifically, discover who is ultimately privileged in the literature itself. When applied to Orwell’s work, this framework enables us to locate the unsettling ruptures in Burmese Days where the novel’s function as a political commentary stutters. Applying contrapuntal theory to Burmese Days, I locate the primary dysfunction of the novel’s imperialist critique in its reproduction of colonialist body-logic.

Before we move to the text itself, it is critical to define body-logic and how it is a particularly insidious form of colonization that has long-lasting repercussions for indigenous and colonized communities. Utilized by Brendan Hokowhitu in his analysis of colonized physicality, “body-logic” symbolizes for him the mixture of spiritual and physical elements, or what a culture “feels like” (278). I wish to suture this definition with feminist scholarship which considers how Western logic has configured the human body to fit its social constructs. Combining these definitions is not with the intent to divorce the term body-logic from its original meaning—which is created by and belongs specifically to indigenous scholarship—but to expand upon its premises to examine how the body has been a site of colo-
nization not only as a physical object but as a metaphorical subject (and, hence a subject of fiction). When I employ the term ‘body-logic’ here, I reference the cultural, historical, and figurative elements that compose how we think of and contextualize different bodies.

The body has always been a principal site of colonization. In *Discipline and the Other Body*, authors Rao & Pierce explain how colonization purposefully conflates culture and biology to serve its purposes of “othering” bodies and asserting cultural and political dominance (5). Colonialist literature specifically engages with this practice by employing imaginative elements to rehearse anxieties surrounding ‘primitive’ colonized bodies. Here, the Other is cast as wild, raw, animalistic, uncivilized, hyper-sexual, lazy, and foolish in direct opposition to the European, cast as restrained, confident, intellectual, and gentlemanly (*Boehmer* 269). This corporeal colonization is precisely what undermines Orwell’s imperialist critique in *Burmese Days*. Consider Orwell’s depiction of a Burmese man working in Flory’s garden: “He was a lymphatic, half-witted Hindu youth [...] His tongue was also a size too large for his mouth [...] and he] hacked at the dry ground with heavy, clumsy strokes, his tender back-muscles quivering” (*Burmese* 76). In this description, Orwell deploys many Orientalist tropes: the character is described in infantilizing terms (“half-witted”) and inadequate for labor. Note closely how Orwell specifically locates the inferiority of this character in his body—he is unfit for labor because he is “lymphatic,” his muscles “tender,” and he is half-witted because his tongue is “too large” for his mouth. That Orwell portrays a colonized body as a weak body is important; it aids and abets the project of Orientalism, giving biological
justification for a socially constructed dyadism. These degrading depic-
tions of indigenous people are replete throughout the novel. For example,
even when the Burmese people revolt against the blinding of one of their
children by a European club member, Flory finds it “difficult to believe that
Orientals could be dangerous” (249); he is “surprised” when he finds out
that his body is “covered with bruises” (256) even after fighting them in
the flesh and nearly being suffocated by the crowd. Furthermore, Orwell
describes Burmese characters throughout the novel as “fat and lazy,” (76)
“grotesque” (104), “peasants with gnarled muscles” (144), and “hideous as
demons” (97). What emerges from this portrayal of colonized bodies is the
belief that their alleged inferiority is biological, natural, and fixed. Thus,
Orwell’s political project is undermined by his reliance on the very colonial-
ist discourse he is trying to critique.

Performance and the Colonial Gaze

The most visceral illustration of Orwell’s reproduction of colonial-
ist body-logic is the depiction of the Burmese pwe, a form of traditional
Burmese performance combining music, dance, and drama. In this scene,
we witness an encounter between the European and Burmese cultures that
is negotiated by the observation of indigenous bodies. The only two white
Europeans in the crowd, Flory and Elizabeth drop in on this cultural event
as temporary observers, merely surveying the “native crowd” as an exotic
spectacle (Burmese 104). The initial observations of the pwe come from
Elizabeth, who notes the perceived differences of the Burmese characters.
Significantly, Elizabeth perceives this difference in the bodies of the indige-
nous people around her, viewing their alleged malformation as symptomatic of their racial inferiority. For example, the magistrate of the town, U Po Kyin, is described as trying to twist his “elephantine body” around to look at Elizabeth and Flory as they walk into the room (102). The characterization of U Po Kyin as “elephantine” is noteworthy, as it not only degrades his size—a common trope in colonial literature, which typically nurtures a hatred for larger bodies—but also draws from primitivist dialogues by comparing him to an animal. The former observation has been well-studied; in “How Colonialism Shaped Body Shaming,” author Livia Gershon discusses how British occupiers in India often associated heaviness among elites with “weakness, laziness, and cowardice” (np). Indeed, one observer even attributed the “rotundity” of vegetarian Brahmins to “ghee and indolence” (np).

The comparison of U Po Kyin’s body to an elephant is drawn from a long history of colonizers comparing darker-skinned bodies to “jungle animals.” For example, as early as medieval times, black bodies were considered monstrous, sinful, and animalistic by white Europeans. For example, the black subject functioned as the Other “wild man” who was attributed an “aggressive” and “animalistic” sexuality, thus, dialectically opposed to the ideal Christian who lived a life of self-discipline and social order (Defalco 23). It is these tropes, which have been consistently revisited by the colonialist imagination, that ultimately contributed to the primitivist ideology that codified indigenous and black bodies as hyper-sexual and wild creatures. Thus, calling U Po Kyin “elephantine” is not merely an unsavory description, but a vestige of fraught historical discourse derived from white encounters with the racial Other. In this light, Orwell’s depiction of the
Burmese reveals an over-reliance on racist portrayals of the indigenous body, ultimately upsetting his critique of imperialism.

Elizabeth’s observations continue as she encounters many other Burmese men and women during the *pwe* and systematically identifies them as problematic Others. At the beginning of the performance, she notes the crowd of “smelly natives” that she notably identifies as “feral” (*Burmese* 103). The description of the Burmese men as “feral” directly correlates to the construction of the wild Other as animalistic, hypersexual, and disgusting to behold. This is a perception that is also applied to Elizabeth’s observations of Burmese women. For example, a female performer is described as curved at the hips like “petals of a downward-pointing flower” as she meanders through the crowd “languidly,” tosses her cigarette at the men in the orchestra and writhes her “slender arms” (*Burmese* 104). This physical description is amplified by the narrative that accompanies her dance moves: her hands become “like snakeheads,” and her posture becomes “grotesque” (*Burmese* 104). These characterizations clearly echo the scientific discourse of the eighteenth century that tried to pinpoint Black female physicality as animalistic (“snakelike”) and Other (“grotesque”). Considering this string of observations, Elizabeth’s encounter with the Burmese attendees of the *pwe* is a direct embodiment of the colonialist gaze. Even Flory, who is purportedly sympathetic to the Burmese, describes their dancing as “diabolical,” “savage,” and “ugly” (*Burmese* 105). This assessment is disturbingly reliant on the visual aspect of performance. In essence, the critique of indigenous bodies represents an attempt to biologically naturalize ideas of colonization and racial hierarchy. When we place this history in conversation with Orwell’s
representation of the *pwe*—perceived by two European colonizers, who are both intrigued and disgusted by the bodily presentation of the indigenous Other—we begin to unravel weaknesses in *Burmese Days* that have the unfortunate effect of re-inscribing colonialist discourse onto indigenous bodies and relegating them as both Other and inferior.

**Orwell and Strategic Location**

Of course, one might counter this argument by observing that Orwell degrades his European characters to a similar degree as his Burmese characters. Certainly, Orwell is not favorable towards the Englishmen's bodies, either—one man at the club is described as “tiny, wiry-haired,” another “bloated,” and another with a “beefy, ingenuous face” (*Burmese* 20, 21). The protagonist is scorned for the “hideous” birthmark on his face, which gives him a “battered, woebegone” look (17). However, this counterargument is troublesome, for it fails to account for the political, social, and cultural imbalances that texture this novel and the world within which it is produced. In Orientalism, Said emphasizes “strategic location” (28), or a way of describing the author’s position in a text concerning the Orient. When we read *Burmese Days*, we must consider the reality that Orwell is a white European who was born in English-occupied India and, in his young adulthood, worked in the Indian Imperial Police as an officer. Immediately, this creates an imbalance of power between his characters and himself.

This power imbalance is further perceptible in Orwell’s essay “Shooting an Elephant,” which employs racist language that inevitably demonizes colonized bodies, even as he rebukes colonialism. He describes
the Burmese as “sneering yellow faces” and “wretched” prisoners with “grey, cowed faces” (1, 2), all of which degrade the indigenous body and concretizes their identity as the racial Other. Interestingly, Orwell seems aware of this contradiction. He writes: “Theoretically—and secretly, of course—I was all for the Burmese and all against their oppressors...[but] I was stuck between my hatred of the empire I served and my rage against the evil-spirited little beasts” (2). In Orwell & Empire, Douglas Kerr points out the hypocrisy implicit in this perspective: “although he became a critic of this business of empire, he had been its willing agent. Nobody forced him into making his career in the East after he left school [...] He chose the Indian police” (7). Furthermore, the internal conflict that Orwell describes in “Shooting an Elephant” seems to suggest a degree of hindsight that comes from a more informed perspective, perhaps developed later in Orwell’s anti-imperialist political stance. Yet, this self-awareness fails to metabolize as he still relies on racist language to depict the Burmese people and persistently places himself as “in the right” even when criticizing his own actions. We see this again in The Road to Wigan Pier when Orwell describes his final break with colonial Burma. Though he claims he was “not going back to be a part of that evil despotism,” in the same breath, he writes of the “innumerable” prisoners, subordinates, peasants, servants, and “coolies,” that he had beaten in fits of rage, justifying this by adding that “nearly everyone does these things in the East [...] orientals can be very provoking” (Road 148). It is also pertinent to note that Orwell wrote on more than one occasion that, though he decried imperialism, he believed that you can rule a subject race “if you honestly believe yourself to be racially superior” (“As I Please”). This quote illumi-
nates our discussion of colonization, race, and power imbalance in Orwell’s work, as it demonstrates that his conceptions of power are inextricable from racial hierarchy. Emphasizing strategic location thus reveals to us the inconsistencies of Orwell’s personal politics, which ultimately resurface, re-packaged and fitted with new characters, in *Burmese Days*. Despite his open rejection of colonialist “despotism,” Orwell nevertheless repeats the very imperialist discourse he is attempting to critique.

Unfortunately, Orwell’s lack of self-reflection is not uncommon in colonial literature. As Abdul R. JanMohamed demonstrates, colonial novels often take one of two approaches, each with the unfortunate result of endorsing colonization to an extent: imaginary texts are defined as texts that are outright in their defense of colonization, while symbolic texts are largely preoccupied with the “egalitarian imperatives of Western societies” and often “thematize the problem of colonialist mentality and its encounter with the racial Other” (66). JanMohammed defines the latter approach as a purportedly innocent, objective depiction of the racial Other that nevertheless “valorizes the superiority of European culture” (65). Rather than seeing the Other as a bridge toward “syncretic possibility,” symbolic texts use the indigenous body as a mirror that “reflects the colonialist’s self-image” (65). The author cites E. M. Forster’s *A Passage to India* and Rudyard Kipling’s *Kim* as pertinent examples of the symbolic canon, as both novels attempt to find “syncretic solutions to the Manichean opposition of the colonizer and the colonized” (66). The concern with this form of representation is that while it appears to invest in the positive integration of difference, it is simultaneously seduced by the Same-Other framework. As a novel that attempts
to examine the political and cultural gulf between European colonizers and the Burmese people whilst still relying on Eurocentric discourse to do so, *Burmese Days* inevitably aligns with the “symbolic” category.

Another curious overlap between symbolic texts and *Burmese Days* is the continued use of racialized tropes and physical stereotypes despite purported anti-colonialist positionality. For example, in *Kim*, which chronicles the life of an Irish orphan in India, Kipling also relies on racialized tropes of indigenous bodies: the Indian men in his story are described as “wild-eyed, wild-haired,” with “dull fat eyes” and the Indian women are described as “withered and undesirable” (np). These specific tropes ascribed to Indian or Burmese people are anticipated by the canon of Orientalist literature that co-constructs a mythology of the biological inferiority of colonized bodies. It also contributes (consciously or not) to physiognomy: the study of systematic correspondence of psychological characteristics to facial features or body structure (Britannica). This discipline was specifically leveled against Black, indigenous, and other people of color as a mechanism of colonization. For example, in a pamphlet from 1850, African American features are described as indicating natural “subservience,” echoing a common justification for slavery (Redfield np). Unfortunately, Orwell casts his characters in a similar vein: Burmese characters are described as “half-naked,” “barbaric,” “hideous as demons,” and “savage” (*Burmese* 97). Because Orwell draws from racialized stereotypes to describe and satirize his Burmese characters, and uses the body to communicate national character, his narrative by default privileges European colonizers and falls in with other symbolic texts of this genre. His critique thus becomes, inevitably, illegitimate.
Perspective, Power, and Patriarchy

Perhaps the starkest example of this dynamic can be found when examining the opposition between Ma Hla May and Elizabeth. Both objects of Flory’s desire, these two women (one Burmese, one English) are composed in relation to and opposite one another. Where Elizabeth is “youthful” (Burmese 80), Ma Hla May is a “hag” (273); Elizabeth’s face is “chalk-white” (80), but Ma Hla May’s is “grey” (273). Where Elizabeth’s features are “delicate, regular” (82), Ma Hla May’s are “grotesque” and “shapely” (53). The latter description of Elizabeth is fascinating: the adjective “regular” implies that Elizabeth’s features are according to custom, defined, and natural. This characterization of Elizabeth positions Ma Hla May (who, in all manners, is portrayed as the opposite of Elizabeth) as definitively irregular: against custom, unnatural. Indeed, this juxtaposition is one that Flory notes himself. When the two women briefly meet, Flory observes: “No contrast could have been stranger; the one faintly colored as an apple-blossom, the other dark and garish” (87). Equating Elizabeth to an “apple blossom,” a white flower indicative of amorousness and virginity next to Ma Hla May’s “metallic” gleam and “cylinder of ebony hair” (87) speaks volumes to the overt racialization of these characters and the hyper-valuation of the Western body. The dialectical opposition of these characters is thus co-constructive: it naturalizes the assumption that the Burmese are inferior through a series of physical characterizations that rely on racialized tropes. Because of this racialized power imbalance, the perspective of the novel shifts: it is always the English looking in on the ‘Oriental,’ scrutinizing, analyzing, and never the other way around. This dimension disproportionately critiques
colonized bodies and borrows from racist vocabulary to do so, ultimately reproducing a harmful body-logic that deeply undermines Orwell’s critique.

Specular dimensionality is a power schema that applies not only to discourses of colonization but patriarchy as well; and as many feminist scholars have previously examined, it is impossible to have one without the other. In “Architecture from Without,” Diana I. Agrest investigates the specular dynamics of Western conceptions of the male and female bodies. She writes that the dominant use of logocentrism and anthropomorphism (both frameworks that think in terms of ‘negative’ and ‘positive’ space) has long configured how the Western world has viewed the human body. In this framework, the positive construct is the male body; the negative construct is the female body (Agrest 29). This, of course, inevitably privileges the male perspective and views man as the complete Self in dialectical opposition to woman, or the Other. This script of Western body-logic becomes even more treacherous when it intersects with racial discrimination; a combination of oppressions that African American feminists such as Claudia Jones have defined as “double jeopardy” (Lynn 2). A fruitful demonstration of this can be found in the portrayal of the relationship between Ma Hla May and Flory. For example, when Ma Hla May asks for money from him, she is described as laying “prostrate in front of him, face hidden, arms extended, as though before a god’s altar” (Burmese 155). The power imbalance of this tableau is stark. It not only emphasizes how Ma Hla May is desperate and “maniacal” (263) but also positions Flory in the position of a god. Notably, this scene is from Flory’s perspective: we are quite literally looking down upon Ma Hla May as she prostrates herself on the floor. These dynamics
are reinforced again when she confronts Flory for taking her virginity and rejecting her in favor of a white woman. Bursting into the church, Ma Hla May is immediately described in terms of her physical appearance: “Her face was grey with powder, her greasy hair was tumbling down [...] She looked like a screaming hag of the bazaar” (272). This characterization immediately locates Ma Hla May’s alleged madness in her physical body, transforming her from the young girl she was mere weeks ago to a “grey hag.” This description reveals more about those perceiving her than her actual material presence. In clearer terms, we are given a portrait of Ma Hla May through the colonizers’ eyes: we view her body as old and hideous even when we know her to be a young and attractive woman.

This is an obvious example of the specular dimensions of *Burmese Days*: even in a scene that is supposed to function as a public ruination of Flory’s reputation, the power dynamics of this scene ultimately focus on the degradation of Ma Hla May. A lone Burmese woman amongst white clergy, she becomes a spectacle for reprobation; and it is only because of Flory’s connection to her that he is considered an outcast. The portrayal of these characters’ bodies thus reproduces Orientalist discourse by relying on and concretizing the Self/Other, specular/ocular, colonizer/colonized discourse.

Colonial Embodiment

Orwell’s critique is finally devastated by the ending of the novel. When he is rejected by Elizabeth, publicly humiliated by Ma Hla May, and without hope of redemption, Flory decides to end his life. Some scholars, such as Praseeda Gopinath, have interpreted Flory’s suicide as a metaphor
for the futility of British occupation, suggesting that colonization harms not only the colonized but all involved (220). However, to metaphorize Flory's suicide, a decisively embodied act, without considering its physical implications, would be a disservice to our analysis of the text. Critical to this scene is its physical nature: Flory's death is a bodily manifestation of his desire to destroy what ostracizes him from the community. When we come to this question—what ostracizes him—we are faced with the political and cultural ambivalence that contextualizes Flory's character.

An Englishman by birth but raised in Burma, Flory continually feels frustration about the liminality of his identity and inability to commit either to the role of the colonizer or a supporter of the Burmese people. This difference manifests physically on his body in the form of a birthmark, a physical demarcation that separates him from the other Europeans, and something that Flory always remembers when he “had done something to be ashamed of” (Burmese 54). It is what Gopinath terms the “visual, bodily manifestation of Flory as a developing, not fully functional, late imperial Englishman” (216). This analysis of Flory's birthmark gains significance at the end of the novel, when Orwell writes that is “finally, the birthmark that had damned him” (Burmese 278). In other words, it is the birthmark that ultimately prevents Orwell from ever attaining the identity of an attractive Englishman that he both despises and craves (278).

Flory fails in many ways to fulfill the role of the ideal English gentleman: he cannot hunt, he flounders as a merchant, he is unattractive, and is ridiculed by other Europeans. Each of these characteristics aligns him closer to the Other rather than Self (and thus, in the context of the
novel, closer to the Burmese people). Flory’s inability to conform to English standards thus constitutes his “weakest spot,” and U Po Kyin is aware of this when he prompts Ma Hla May to publicly humiliate Flory in front of the other Europeans, particularly Elizabeth (Burmese 244). When he kills himself, after realizing that he will never be able to perform the role of the perfect Englishman, Flory is in a sense attempting to “kill off” the Burmese part of himself. In this lens, we may understand Flory’s suicide as an act that attempts to ameliorate the projection of racial identities upon the body. This, of course, leads us to the problematic nature of Flory’s death, which is that it symbolizes the undesirability of living even tangentially to the colonized people. While this may not be the conscious thesis on Orwell’s part, the subliminal philosophy speaks clearly; the othering of Flory and the violence leveled against his character all ultimately suggest that the colonized body is the weaker body.

Conclusion

Applying a theoretical framework that relies on historical context and power dynamics, we can begin to unravel Orwell’s Burmese Days as a colonial commentary and locate its areas of collapse. Specifically, our analysis snags upon Orwell’s depiction of colonized bodies, which borrows from a racist vocabulary and ultimately contributes to an ongoing Orientalist discourse that undermines anti-colonialist critique. This, as we have examined, has the unfortunate effect of naturalizing indigenous communities as the ‘weaker’ and ‘Other’ bodies, creating a socially constructed hierarchy that positions Europe and the West at the center. Of course, our analysis
raises the critical question: why is the codification of bodies more signifi-
cant, more overpowering than Orwell’s intended critique? To assess this
question, it is critical to assess the longevity of Orwell’s depiction of racial-
ized bodies—how body-logic is particularly long-lasting because it grafts
socially-constructed stereotypes onto the physical realm in a way that alters
our physical interactions: our perspectives, our policies, and our politics.
To effectively undermine colonialist logic in our critiques and our activism,
we must eliminate racial biases and dualist schematics that trap bodies in a
pseudo-logic, moving to a more inclusive and positive body-logic.
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