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or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples.” These largely demeaning and insulting proclamations from on high by the self-proclaimed advanced nations, a.k.a., white messiahs, embodied a historical form of paternalism over people of color and has perpetuated the so-called white man’s burden of manifest destiny.

CRITICAL RACE THEORY AS INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS LAW

by Natsu Taylor Saito*

Growing out of and in response to the Critical Legal Studies Movement (CLS), Critical Race Theory (CRT) has viewed the legal system as one whose aim is to perpetuate a status quo that protects the accumulation of wealth and power in the hands of a few, and uses racial divisions and discrimination to do so. Focusing on “race” has been necessary because of the history of racism in the United States; a racial focus has also been useful in addressing questions of justice and human rights because of the intertwining of racism, poverty and systematic disadvantaging.

Such a focus entails certain shortcuts, however. Those of us who are CRT scholars have not developed clear analyses of the relationships between race and class, between political influence and economic power, between the repression of domestic minorities and the exploitation of the “Third World” by U.S. interests. As we recognize that the borders of our nations are not impermeable, but instead quite porous, we are forced to recognize the inadequacies of our analyses, to see how our shortcuts are catching up with us.

Also growing out of CLS, New Approaches to International Law (NAIL) and Third World Approaches to International Law (TWAIL) extend critical analysis to international law. In this realm, we have pointed out the deficiencies of a framework founded on the primacy of national sovereignty, emphasized the rights of individuals and of “peoples” as against those of their governments, and supported the development of universal standards of human rights. We often tout the breakdown of nation-states and the “globalization” of economies, cultures and legal systems.

However, we have not envisioned or articulated what kind of “globalized” world we want to see, with the result that corporate interests, with their culture-eradicating functions, are taking over, appearing to be the only alternative to reactionary nationalism.

From an international perspective, we see how the United States’ actions, policies, etc., exert significant influence on the advancement of international human rights. From the domestic side, we see how international policy and the (mis)treatment of those identified as “foreign” affects the treatment of domestic minorities. But we rarely do a unified analysis.

We can agree on some basics—the principles set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; the importance of ensuring the provision of food, shelter, education and medical care to all; the elimination of gross disparities of wealth and power. We need now to analyze what causes these disparities and the oppressive conditions under which so many people live, and how we get to a system in which one group’s material well-being does not come at the cost of others’ survival—a system in which there is real justice.

*Georgia State University College of Law, Atlanta, GA.