### V1: Nepantla

#### Expansion of national service in any regard directly emphasizes citizenship and patriotism
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Surely one of these ends is the engagement of young Americans in public life. As Peter Hart and Mario Brossard argue here, the evidence of many surveys suggests that young Americans are deeply engaged in civic activity. In his 2000 campaign, Senator John McCain—initially a skeptic of national service, now a strong supporter—won a wide following among the young by urging them to aspire to things “beyond your own self-interest.” Service learning, increasingly popular in our public schools, has been linked with a heightened sense of civic responsibility and personal effectiveness. If the new generation connected its impulses to service with a workable politics, it could become one of the great reforming generations in our nation’s history. And service could become a pathway to a stronger sense of citizenship. As Jane Eisner argues, service “must produce more than individual fulfillment for those involved and temporary assistance for those in need.” It should, she says, “lead to an appetite for substantive change, a commitment to address the social problems that have created the need for service in the first place.” Eisner suggests that as a nation, we should celebrate the First Vote cast by young people with the same fanfare that greets other moments of passage to adult responsibility. The goal would be to encourage a new generation that is gravitating toward national service to make the connection “between service to the community and the very process that governs community life.” A focus on service and the links it forges between rights and responsibilities of citizenship could also offer new ways out of old political impasses. For example, Andrew Stern, the president of the Service Employees International Union, suggests that a two-year commitment to national service could become a pathway for undocumented workers to legalize their status and for legal immigrants to speed their passage to citizenship. And former felons now denied voting rights might “earn credits toward restoration of full citizenship” through service. Jeff Swartz, the CEO of Timberland, offers practical proposals for business at a moment when the public demand for responsible corporate behavior is rising. He suggests that obligations to shareholders, to employees, and to the community are linked. One reason his company is on Fortune magazine’s list of the 100 “Best Companies to Work For” is its program of service sabbaticals through which employees can spend up to six months working at existing or start-up nonprofits. Their purpose is not simply to do “good works,” but also to build the capacity of the organizations that promote social change. At its best, service is not make-work but what Harry Boyte and Nancy Kari, in Building America, have called “public work.” It is work that “is visible, open to inspection, whose significance is widely recognized” and can be carried out by “a mix of people whose interests, backgrounds, and resources may be quite different.” Service as public work is the essence of the democratic project. It solves common problems and creates common things. Public work entails not altruism, or not only altruism, but enlightened self-interest—a desire to build a society in which the serving citizen wants to live. It is possible to be cynical about the new call to service. It can be a terribly convenient way for politicians to seem to be calling for sacrifice without demanding much of citizens. At little cost to themselves, advocates of both conservative and liberal individualism can use service to shroud their real intentions in the decent drapery of community feeling. Service, badly conceived, can distance citizens from public problems. Those who serve can help people “out there,” as if the problems “they” have are disconnected from the society in which the server lives. The sociologist Michael Schudson has argued that President Bush’s ideal citizen is a “Rotarian, moved by a sense of neighborliness, Christian charity, and social responsibility, but untouched by having a personal stake in public justice.” His point is not to knock Rotarians. It’s to argue that self-interest in pursuit of justice is a virtue. As Schudson notes in describing the civil rights movement, the most dramatic expansion of democracy and citizenship in our lifetime was brought about by citizens “driven not by a desire to serve but by an effort to overcome indignities they themselves have suffered.” It’s an important point. But it’s also true that Rotarians are good citizens. Neighborliness, charity, and social responsibility are genuine virtues. It is both good and useful to assert, as Rabbi Chaim of Volozhin did, that “my neighbor’s material needs are my spiritual needs.” It’s just possible that a nation responding to the call to service would, over time, become a nation deeply engaged in questions of public justice. The debate over national service is a debate over how we Americans think of ourselves. It’s a debate over how we will solve public problems and what we owe our country and each other. If our nation is to continue to prosper, it’s a debate we will have in every generation. For if we decide there are no public things to which we are willing to pledge some of our time and some of our effort—not to mention “our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor”—then we will have quietly abandoned our nation’s experiment in liberty rooted in mutual assistance and democratic aspiration.

#### Narratives of citizenship has and will continue to be anti-latino. You are feeding into the pervasive and violent rhetoric that we are forced to succumb to every day, the rhetoric that contributed to the repeal of DACA. The discourse of citizenship continues to live at the borders of just white enough and too deviant.
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One of the goals of modernity8 was to change the obscurantism of the world into reason. During this period, the European civilization expanded all over the world due to the fact that they managed to carry on the social production of frontiers; a concept that according to Walter D. Mignolo and Madina V. Tlostanova was described as a line indicating the last point in the relentless march of civilization. On the one side of the frontiers was civilization; on the other; nothing, just barbarism or emptinessi (Mignolo and Tlostanova, 2006: 205).9 According to this classification, civilization was meant to be a synonym of Western Europe while barbarism was to be understood as the remainder, i.e. Africa, Asia, and America. From this context, then, frontiers became the spaces of influence that Europeans accommodated to exercise control over its periphery on the basis of racist values that led to the establishment of opposing categories such as us and them, or, we and others. With this classification, Europe attempted to appoint itself the center of the world and tried to divide up the earth to organize the world as exploitation and to export the border form to the periphery (Balibar, 2004: 7). Thus, exporting the border form to the periphery not only implied organizing the world in units called nation-states, but it also meant developing a cultural or spiritual nationalism that required citizens to associate the democratic universality of human rights with particular national belonging leading inevitably to systems of exclusion: the divide between populations considered native and those considered foreign, heterogeneous, who are racially or culturally stigmatized (Balibar, 2004: 8). This mechanism was crucial to sustain colonization since colonized people were, obviously, not considered citizens of the imperial government; thereby they should not have access to rights since they were not considered citizens in the first place. Castro-Gomez gives us a similar argument that is worth transcribing at length: Citizenship was not only restricted to men who were married, literate, heterosexual, and proprietors, but also, and especially, to men who were white. In turn, the individuals that fell outside the space of citizenship were not only the homosexuals, prisoners, mental patients and political dissidents Foucault had in mind, but also blacks Indians, mestizos, gypsies, Jews, and now, in terms of globalization, ethnic minorities, immigrants and Auslandern (foreigners) (Castro-Gomez and Johnson, 2000: 513). To be sure, Europeans not only denied colonized people a citizen status but they also classified native people as inhuman, devilish, or even animals, as inscribed in the philosophies predicated by Kant (1764), Hegel (1822), and others who considered that underdevelopment was a characteristic proper of non-Europeans (Natter, 2008). Thus, since colonized people could not be treated as equals, it was quite acceptable to use their labor and land to benefit the colonizers, a belief that has been extended to the present-day, as Mignolo and Tlostanova explain: [T]he rhetoric of modernity (and globalization) of salvation continues to be implemented on the assumption of the inferiority or devilish intentions of the other and, therefore, continues to justify oppression and exploitation as well as the eradication of the difference (Mignolo and Tlostanova, 2006: 206). Change, in the European view, consisted of turning savages into "gentlemen" and of bringing them into civilization. However, until the moment when that change actually happened Europeans did not need to take into account the voice, contributions, and knowledge of the colonized. In that way, the epistemologies of indigenous peoples were shadowed in obscurantism, and reason was considered a characteristic exclusively associated with whiteness, where epistemologies of colored people were denied as such. Accounts of this have been recorded by researchers such as Dwight Conquergood who explains, since the enlightenment project of modernity, the first way of knowing has been preeminent. Marching under the banner of science and reason, it has disqualified and repressed other ways of knowing that are rooted in embodied experience, orality and local contingencies (Conquergood, 2002: 146). On similar lines, we find Mignolo and Tlostanova (2006), who complain that the epistemologies of the colonized were erased from world history, since they held no value in the eyes of Europeans. Thus, the following step in colonization consisted of imposing assimilation into European settler cultures; that is how the Nahuatl and Maya languages were changed into Spanish, the Congolese, Kituba, or Lingala into French, or the Dahomeyan into English. This was also the reason why millions of people were forced to abandon their religion in order to be converted into Christianity. In sum, the culture, traditions, and religion of colonized people were used against them to justify oppression. For instance, the art and writing of the Maya civilization was destroyed under the justification that Maya texts were considered pagan. Similarly, the religious rites and human sacrifices of the Aztec culture were used as a justification for the destruction and subjugation of the Aztec people. Although these events are highly problematic in themselves, there exist additional implications that are more disturbing; namely, the fact that the world inherited from modernity an international system that associates certain identities with specific geographical places, thereby implying the problematic assumption that to say we have an identity is just to say that we have a location in social space, a hermeneutic horizon that is both grounded in a location and an opening or site from which we attempt to know the world (Saldivar, 2007: 344). Saldivar criticizes this argument, since accepting it will be constitutive of geographical determinism,10 which attempts to establish a direct association between the degree of development in a nation, culture, or individual and his geographical location in the globe. So, for instance, it is believed that the reason why there is poverty in Colombia, Venezuela, or the Caribbean is because these countries are located in the south; a region where nature produces food easier than in the north, thus making people in the south lazier and more reluctant to work, create, and innovate. Of course, this version does not take any account of colonial history when attempting to explain the reasons why certain nations are economically more developed than others. In conclusion, modernity implies that ìcertain areas of the planet were [are] designated as the location of the barbarians and of the primitives (Mignolo and Tlostanova, 2006: 205).

#### The aff is a personification of the American frontier, they exist on the border where colonialism is conventional and European purity is the goal. This is a literal threat to bodies like mine every day but the metaphor of the border only continues to ratify dualist thinking and perpetuates inescapable violence through an epistemology of otherization.
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After the annexation of the territory of Northern Mexico and the solidification of the border between Mexico and the U.S. along the Rio Grande by the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, the formerly Mexican inhabitants of the region were suddenly governed by the American side and became, due to their mestizo/mestiza racial origins,   their linguistic competence, and their class belonging, de facto second-category American citizens, since the incorporation of Mexican Americans or Chicanos/as into the U.S. nation would complicate the supremacist imperative for maintaining European racial purity (Madsen, “The West” 379). The United States became the second colonizing power after Spain. This moment can retrospectively be read as a defining one with respect to Chicano/a national consciousness. Under the banner of the Chicano Movement, the descendants of the annexed Mexicans would go on to forge the “Bronze Nation” (Alurista 1). To Chicanos and Chicanas,the symbolic mental map of the American Southwest would become a native land colonized by white American culture, while their strategically construed mythical homeland of Aztlán remains more or less beyond the borders of immediate American control: in the ancestral home, i.e., in the region of Mexico. 23Under the influence of the border, the economic, but even more so the social, cultural, linguistic, religious, and epistemological diversity reproduced and underscored in the lived reality of borderland subjects as well as in their literary production represents a radical re-evaluation of prevailing notions of American identity. The dominant notion is based on the myth of immigration-as-homogenization, in which European immigrants are those who build a new American nation as an extension of forging a new life for themselves. The traditional immigrant “Dream of Ellis Island” (Tinnemeyer 475) is, however, deeply challenged by borderland subjects: by mestizo/a Chicanos and Chicanas, but also by members of Native communities, the original targets of colonialism. They all represent an immigration that is never conventionally “completed” (e.g. by acquiring legal citizenship, cultural integration, or an assimilated status), for they cannot by definition “land in America”; they never “arrive.” Borderland subjects have been present from the beginning. They take a conscious stance against the idea of American-ness as the product of the proverbial melting pot. Chicanos/as have never been (im)migrants, as they never crossed the U.S. border: the border crossed them. vii Thus, their non-(im)migrant belonging makes them invisible and thus uncategorizable within the concept of ideally white American-ness with a history of immigration from Europe. 24 The employment of metaphor for the conceptualization of borderlands in Anzaldúa’s Borderlands/La Frontera opens new ways for understanding the complex region and Chicana identity. Mestiza consciousness, an epistemology generated by the proximity of the border, represents an emancipatory and self-reflecting program with the opportunity to theoretically grasp the situation in the U.S.-Mexican borderlands and to deconstruct the discriminatory binary oppositions implied by the Western conceptualization of “the border.” As already suggested, the Mexican-U.S. border operates not only on the level of its real, physical presence. Harkening back to one of the cornerstones of American cultural identity—the myth of the westward American frontier as proof of the success of the American conquest/settlement project—the border instantly takes on a metaphorical aspect that ties it to the notion of the American “us” and the Mexican “them” (Quintana 16). 25 On the metaphorical level, the border in question is “infinitely elastic” (Aldama 46), allowing us to extend the expression “the American borderlands” to all regions, including internal ones, that show resistance to Euro-American cultural dominance. Among the symptoms of Euro-American cultural supremacy is an unshakeable belief in westward expansion, as celebrated by Frederick Jackson Turner and others, which gives rise to the American national narrative with its goal to legitimize the conquest of indigenous cultures: the manifest destiny lifted from Puritan tradition. This myth endows Americans of European origin with rule-power over the continent as determined by divine providence, and designates them bearers of a strict code of individualism that enables them to successfully face the trials of the New World and, thanks to this experience of adversity, become the new American nation with functional democratic institutions (Turner 5-36). This nation is, however, defined solely within the bounds of European ethnicity and cultural tradition—and any nation defined in such a way that it rests on the values of white androcentrism is “located within a powerful discourse of Anglo-Saxon superiority and inevitable racial destiny” (Madsen, “The West” 381). 26 According to Slotkin, the Western American frontier stands for one of the major myths that generally inform the American identity—which, from the perspective of the (post)colonial center, is the supposedly desirable white, masculine, and heterosexual tradition—including its mythical belief in a vacant, uninhabited, wild continent ripe for the settling Europeans’ mission of civilization and enculturation into something “new.” This myth also serves to legitimize the violent suppression of the allegedly “uncivilized” “natives,”viiiwho are consequently labeled as a “tame” indigenous population and linked to femininity in opposition to the dominating masculinity of the white settlers. In “We Call Them Greasers,” as discussed above, the concept of the emasculated Chicano becomes evident in the lynching scene of the tied up farmer and husband who witnesses his wife’s rape and demise. 27 The atrocities of colonialism portrayed by Anzaldúa in the poem can take place precisely because the discourse of racial supremacy and entitlement vested by the divine authority constructs an ideology of imperialism which is meant to legitimize the deeds carried out under its banner. Essentially, this is a tautological logic which is not unlike the workings of the discourse of orientalism detected by Edward Said. The heavenly assignment of manifest destiny is performed by the Anglo colonizer’s implied duress arising from his authority, which makes the Mexican-American or Chicano land owners behave as if they were in the presence of a deity (see Saldívar-Hull 75). Their gestures may be viewed as showing respect and/or fear. The poem reads: “they took off their hats / placed them over their hearts / lowered their eyes in my presence” (156). 28 Although the colonizer’s assumption of such a god-like position equals blasphemy in Christian terms, the poem makes it clear from the matter-of-fact depiction of the treatment of the Chicanos that the Anglo perpetrator’s confidence in his actions is unshakable and his power unmatchable to such an extent that he feels no need to attenuate his explicit language of scorn, contempt for the “brown” people, and an air of boredom he is experiencing while dealing with them and their mild protests: “cowards, they were, no backbone / ... oh, there were a few troublemakers / ... it was a laughing stock” (Borderlands156). The narrator’s choice of words nearly makes it seem as if the criminal seizure of land from the hands of the farmers is actually a bothering task for the Anglo figure; not because he is not enjoying the exercise of his white privilege, but because the people he must dispossess of land are not even deemed as worth his effort. In his eyes they pose an obstacle to the civilizing mission of westward expansion. The interjection “oh” also emphasizes the steadfast conviction about the justification of the colonial project: on the one hand, it may be read as fleeing reminiscence of an event that is, within the mission, so generic that it cannot be easily recollected, on the other hand it implies Anzaldúa’s attempt at bringing into memory and discourse the representation of events which were overlooked by the dominant versions of history. 29The fact that Anzaldúa writes about dispossession, violence, rape, and murder significantly reinterprets and reshapes the history of the Western frontier. She is interested in what I have called above “the grey zone,” i.e., the events that occurred between the invention of the frontier destined to be pushed west and its assumed closure. Anzaldúa’s poem does exactly what (in Fisher’s term) new regionalism aims to uncover and bring into awareness: she confronts us with withheld views of colonization and with previously invisibilized images of both physical and discursive violence. The fact that in “We Call Them Greasers” the Anglo usurper does not differentiate among the Chicano rancheros, whose land he strives to confiscate under false pretenses of unpaid taxes, testifies to how, in Anzaldúa’s view, colonization deprived the colonized people of their subjectivity and relegated them into the sphere beyond the human. 30 The Chicanos in the poem lack names and the Anglo narrator systematically uses the third person plural pronoun to speak of the farmers. Thereby he first deletes their individual identity and then he turns their suffering into a universal experience of the colonized people, discursively making such an experience prescriptive for any other clash with any colonial power they may ever face. The farmers who are eventually chased from their land become voiceless because of their linguistic background and because of the fact that within the context of American colonial expansion they lack a discourse in which they could articulate their rights and be heard (Spivak 308-309). If some of them who “had land grants / and appealed to the courts” nevertheless manage to resist the colonizing despotism, they are shut up by the institutional tyranny that does not recognize Spanish as a language, “them not even knowing English” (Borderlands156). Saldívar-Hull sums up the silencing as follows: “For the Anglo-American imperialist, literacy in Spanish or any other nonstatus language is illiteracy” (75). 31 As Slotkin points out, the westward progression of the American frontier has been part of American national identity since the 17th century and related to the myth that the expected cultural regeneration of the continent could be realized by violence (Slotkin 5; Furniss 22). Therefore, when Anzaldúa portrays the effects of westward expansion as brutal, violent, and dehumanizing, she thwarts the ideal of westward progress as a carrier of a civilizing mission, yet she complies with Slotkin’s thesis in regards to the penetrative violence. Despite this congruence, however, her approach in general by no means agrees to the idea of violence having any regenerative potential whatsoever. If regeneration is demanded, in Western dualistic thinking it inevitably reacts to previous degeneration. Such binarism essentially links people of color with impurity and contamination, whereas dominant whiteness is aligned with purity and clearly defined edges and/or borders of identity. 32 In other words, regeneration through violence poses a discriminatory potential for lethal practices. In this respect, the alarming outcome of Anzaldúa’s poem is grounded in a simple, but immensely efficient idea: a woman of color addresses the racial values of American colonialism through a white man’s voice but she assigns the story to the Chicanos’/as’ experience and their current lives on the border and “in-between.” Anzaldúa, through the manner in which the poem is composed and formally executed, positions the American and Chicano/a perspectives next to each other. Thus, as Madsen observes, the work tells two stories at once: “a story of colonial dispossession and a story of the westward advance of American civilization.... The poem then articulates what Paul de Man called an ‘aporia’—an irresolvable contradiction between two logical positions” (“Counter-Discursive” 67).Anzaldúa, however, does not seek a final solution to this encumbrance; such contradiction is the reality of mestiza consciousness.

#### Thus the alternative is to reject the aff to embrace the *nepantla* and remap our understanding of borders and citizenship discourse under a new lens of hybridity. Our alt exists in the borderlands, free from binary thinking – only voting negative solves in this round specifically.
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It was in the context of the Chicano and feminist movement that Gloria Anzaldua addressed the concept of borderlands in a multi dimensional way. That is, similar to the previous authors, Anzaldua situated her notion of a geographical borderland to be located in the Southwest, but she added ideological and epistemological dimensions to the previous concept. Accordingly, territoriality happens to be only one of the many elements in which the Borderlands24 theory is founded. When referring to the geographical aspect, Anzaldua stated: the actual physical borderlands that I’m dealing with in this book is the Texas-U.S. southwest/Mexican border. The psychological borderlands, the sexual borderlands and the spiritual borderlands are not particular to the southwest (Anzaldua a, 1987: preface). Although Anzaldua does not delimit the entire scope of the borderlands cartographically speaking, she shows awareness of the fact that, in the first place, the geographical borderlands is one that involves a territory previously under Mexican jurisdiction and second that this territory does not exclusively pertain to the U.S. but it includes parts of Mexico that are proximate to the border and share a common and unique culture that is neither Mexico or the U.S. In short, Anzaldua is dealing with geographical borderlands 24 It is important to note that the Gloria Anzald ̇a made a distinction between Borderlands with regular b and Borderlands with capital B. Borderlands with regular b refers to the southwest or Canada-U.S. border, while capitalized Borderlands refers to emotional Borderlands. K. Urch, M. D. a. J. A. (1995). "Working the Borderlands, Becoming Mestiza: an interview with Gloria Anzaldua." disClosure(4): pp.75-96. 25 forcibly includes Mexico where Mexican-Americans/Chicanos are treated as conquered people or as inferior from an Anglo point of view. We infer this from reading the next paragraph: Gringos in the US Southwest consider the [Hispanic] inhabitants of the borderlands transgressors, aliens whether they posses documents or not, whether they’re Chicanos, Indians, or blacks. Do not enter; trespassers will be raped, maimed, strangled, gassed, shot. The only legitimate inhabitants are those in power, the whites and those who align themselves with whites (Anzaldua, 1987: 7). Anglo-Americans coexistence with Mexicans, Indians, mestizos, or blacks in Texas, California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Colorado has been always conflictive. From the beginning, the Anglo-American society put a great deal of effort to force Mexicans to abandon not only their lands, but also their social, political, and cultural values in order to adopt the Anglo institutions. Overall, the Mexican culture was incompatible with that of Anglo-Americans, which is why the former should be abandoned. However, Nostrand (1970) considers that the process of assimilation among Mexican-Americans was slow given that Mexicans had their fatalism, a product of religion, their lack of emphasis on achieving or making good, because of their language, and so on. If we follow Nostrand on this argument, we would have to state that in order for Mexican-Americans to acculturate, the loss of their culture, social life, and institutions was considered a pre-requisite in order to achieve full citizen status, something that has not happened. Indeed, for Mexican-Americans, their connection to the border and to the Mexican culture is something that cannot be easily erased, since as Anzaldua expresses, being a Mexican is a state of the soul ónot one of mind, not of citizenship (Anzald ̇a, 1987: 62). In addition, for her, the borderland is also a place where contradictory membership in competing cultures and racial identities happen. Nosotros los Chicanos straddle the Borderlands. On one side of us, we are constantly exposed to the Spanish of the Mexicans, on the other side we hear the Anglo’s incessant clamoring so that we forget our language Chicanos and other people of color suffer economically for not acculturating. This voluntary (yet forced) alienation makes for physiological conflict, a kind of dual identity we don’t identify with the Anglo-American cultural values and we don’t totally identify with the Mexican 26 cultural values. We are a synergy of two cultures with various degrees of Mexicanness or Angloness. (Anzald ̇a, 1987: 63) Hence, the conflict of Mexican-Americans/Chicanos is that they live with one foot on each side of the border, their contributions to the economy and the culture of both nations are significant, since the cheap labor that they supply in the U.S. soil increases the profits of American corporations and the remittances that they send back to Mexico prevent the country from facing an economic collapse. Despite their contributions, however, mainstream groups still regard them as defective people in both sides of the border precisely because of the hybridity that they represent. As Mexican-Americans put it, being a Chicano means that the Anglos consider you a Mexican and the Mexicans call you gringo (Anzald ̇a, 1987). This multiplicity of rejection is intimately related to the geographical space that Mexican-Americans occupy, to the history of that particular space, but also to the very notion of border (or frontiers) as a concept which was conceived by Western Europeans as a means to establish spatial hierarchies of civility and barbarism.25 Similarly, Anzald ̇a states: Borders are set up to define the places that are safe and unsafe, to distinguish us from them. A border is a dividing line, a narrow strip along a steep edge. A Borderland is a vague and undetermined place created by the emotional residual of an unnatural boundary. It is in a constant state of transition. The prohibited and forbidden are its inhabitants (Anzald ̇a, 1987: 7). The previous passage presents the borderlands as a tough place in which to live, since the intersection of interests, cultures, people and powers have made of this terrain a dangerous one. In the following section, we will proceed to evaluate the ways in which physical borderlands influenced Anzald ̇aís thought as a foundation for the following chapter in which we will address the Borderlands theory.

#### Our kritik is an act of *La Conciencia de La Mestiza,* walking through our experience in nepantla and suffering in coatlicue only to be reconcilied in Coyolxauhqui to materialize the new mestiza. Only through the endorsement of our journey can we ever begin to resist the border thinking and abandon previous feelings of persecución and open up new spaces of hybridity thus the role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best constructs a mestiza consciousness.
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The final process in the Borderlands theory is La conciencia de la mestiza or the Borderlands consciousness as Anzald ̇a calls it. A long way had to be walked in order to arrive at this stage, yet the confusion that she experienced in nepantla, the agony that she suffered in Coatlicue, and the crushing burden of picking up the pieces in Coyolxauhqui have all produced important outcomes which are materialized in the new mestiza, a consciousness that speaks of resistance. The new mestiza is a space of hybridity, of multiplicity, which means that it is not exclusive of Mexican-Americans/Chicanos, Latin Americans, Indigenous, or Indians. Even white males can have a mestiza consciousness since this is a state of mind. Having a mestiza consciousness means that all the previous processes have prepared the self to engage, to abandon previous feelings of victimization, and to replace them with reason and political action, where reason is to be regarded as the capacity to understand our own position vis-‡-vis those institutions that represent us and demands that we question them constantly. Thus, the person who previously lived as a colonized being, as someone devaluated and stigmatized by the logic of domination no longer accepts to play that role, no longer accepts impositions and marginalization. She instead uses her voice to define herself, to speak for herself and to open new spaces for herself. The mestiza consciousness is now her new identity and she enacts it and performs it on a daily basis. The new mestiza hence is capable of transformation and evolution and her new identity makes her unique. The attributions of this new identity Anzald ̇a describes in Borderlands: The new mestiza copes by developing a tolerance for contradictions, a tolerance for ambiguity. She learns to be an Indian in Mexican culture, to be a Mexican from an Anglo point of view. She learns to juggle cultures. She has a plural personality, she operates in a pluralistic mode nothing is trusted out, the good the bad and the ugly, nothing rejected, nothing abandoned. Not only she sustains contradictions, she turns the ambivalence into something else (Anzald ̇a, 1987: 79). In the new mestiza, feelings of fear and shame together with the wound caused by the separation and subsequent distinction of white/colored, male/female, civilized/barbarians, etc., are healed with a new value system (Anzald ̇a, 1987: 3) in which metaphors are used to reverse the negative stereotypes socially imposed on people by inserting new meanings onto them. Going 53 through the Borderlands helps her to redefine her position not only in her own eyes, but also in the society. Now, she is no longer the voiceless, tamed woman that would not dare to challenge others; to be sure, she is ready to do so, and in turn, she is feared and no longer the one who fears. Yet having a better notion of our own identity is not enough, since the transformation one has suffered does not come without compromises. One of these compromises is to seek the transformation of the overall social structure. Hence, the new mestiza becomes necessarily a political actor as a product of the newly gained identity, who needs to work in favor of creating emancipatory spaces, building communities of solidarity, teaching resistance, transforming institutions, and so on and so forth. Anzaldua shows this political consciousness in the new mestiza when she states, it is not enough to stand in the opposite river bank, shouting questions, challenging patriarchal, white conventions (Anzald ̇a, 1987: 78). Later in that same paragraph, she declares that oneís role as a new mestiza is to act and not to react from what stance, positioning, profession, etc., one may have. However, action must be politically engaged. This struggle is mapped in this way: The first step is to take inventory. Despojando, desgranando, quitando paja this step is a conscious rupture with all oppressive traditions of all cultures and religions. She communicates that rupture, documents the struggle. She reinterprets history, and using the new symbols, she shapes new myths. She adopts new perspectives toward the dark-skinned, women and queers. She strengthens her tolerance for ambiguity. She is willing to share, to make herself vulnerable to foreign ways of seeing and thinking. She surrenders all notions of safety of the familiar She is able to transform herself (Anzald ̇a, 1987: 82-83). Thus, a new consciousness implies a political activism, which for Anzald ̇a was manifested through her writing. Her broader project is to attain political change since this type of change is the kind that can really make the difference in a personís life. Yet, she saw the Borderlands as a theory of processes that needed to be put in practice repeatedly, since people are subject to many kinds of oppressions and being aware of one form does not do the job for all. However, once an identity of la conciencia de la mestiza is assumed, the space of marginalization to which one was relegated becomes the space of resistance from where one follows the task to redefine everything 54 around. Along these lines, Jose David Saldivar explains, la conciencia de la nueva mestiza, for Anzaldua, is neither espanol, ni ingles, but both (SaldÌvar, 2007: 352).

### V2: Defiance

Permission to speak, I am the ally of the silenced and unheard.
**I am the noise you can't shake**.
Two sharp points like the accents I carry on my tongue.
I slither and squirm as I observe what they have done to you.
It's a tragedy what they think of you and how arrogantly **they use you** for self proclaimed prophecies.
No! I am not that! I yell loudly, but only the echo replies.
**Incarceration, deportation, degradation, gentrification** some of the words that burn as I spit them out.
False ideologies are accepted as realities ignoring the facts.
I am not illegal and you don't have the right to label or decide.
**I am not a criminal, never was.**Don't obstruct my academic path, I will jump each and every obstacle one by one.
I was born free, **you labeled and shackled me with lies and hatred** but I broke loose.
With my forked tongue I battle your double sided knife.
I am not content with the destructive pattern that has emerged with your avarice.
**I will not kill for you and I will not die in vain.**
My snake like tongue has no mercy and will not cease until I see dignity and peace obtained\*

#### Expansion of national service in any regard directly emphasizes citizenship and patriotism

Dionne and Drogosz 02 [United We Serve?: The Debate over National Service [E.J. Dionne](https://www.brookings.edu/experts/e-j-dionne/) and [Kayla Meltzer Drogosz](https://www.brookings.edu/author/kayla-meltzer-drogosz/)Sunday, September 1, 2002 <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/united-we-serve-the-debate-over-national-service/> E.J. Dionne, Jr. is a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, a syndicated columnist for the Washington Post, and university professor in the Foundations of Democracy and Culture at Georgetown University. Kayla M. Drogosz is the senior research analyst for the project on religion and civil society at the Brookings Institution] 9/7/17 KAE – highlight by EHSMK

Surely one of these ends is the engagement of young Americans in public life. As Peter Hart and Mario Brossard argue here, the evidence of many surveys suggests that young Americans are deeply engaged in civic activity. In his 2000 campaign, Senator John McCain—initially a skeptic of national service, now a strong supporter—won a wide following among the young by urging them to aspire to things “beyond your own self-interest.” Service learning, increasingly popular in our public schools, has been linked with a heightened sense of civic responsibility and personal effectiveness. If the new generation connected its impulses to service with a workable politics, it could become one of the great reforming generations in our nation’s history. And service could become a pathway to a stronger sense of citizenship. As Jane Eisner argues, service “must produce more than individual fulfillment for those involved and temporary assistance for those in need.” It should, she says, “lead to an appetite for substantive change, a commitment to address the social problems that have created the need for service in the first place.” Eisner suggests that as a nation, we should celebrate the First Vote cast by young people with the same fanfare that greets other moments of passage to adult responsibility. The goal would be to encourage a new generation that is gravitating toward national service to make the connection “between service to the community and the very process that governs community life.” A focus on service and the links it forges between rights and responsibilities of citizenship could also offer new ways out of old political impasses. For example, Andrew Stern, the president of the Service Employees International Union, suggests that a two-year commitment to national service could become a pathway for undocumented workers to legalize their status and for legal immigrants to speed their passage to citizenship. And former felons now denied voting rights might “earn credits toward restoration of full citizenship” through service. Jeff Swartz, the CEO of Timberland, offers practical proposals for business at a moment when the public demand for responsible corporate behavior is rising. He suggests that obligations to shareholders, to employees, and to the community are linked. One reason his company is on Fortune magazine’s list of the 100 “Best Companies to Work For” is its program of service sabbaticals through which employees can spend up to six months working at existing or start-up nonprofits. Their purpose is not simply to do “good works,” but also to build the capacity of the organizations that promote social change. At its best, service is not make-work but what Harry Boyte and Nancy Kari, in Building America, have called “public work.” It is work that “is visible, open to inspection, whose significance is widely recognized” and can be carried out by “a mix of people whose interests, backgrounds, and resources may be quite different.” Service as public work is the essence of the democratic project. It solves common problems and creates common things. Public work entails not altruism, or not only altruism, but enlightened self-interest—a desire to build a society in which the serving citizen wants to live. It is possible to be cynical about the new call to service. It can be a terribly convenient way for politicians to seem to be calling for sacrifice without demanding much of citizens. At little cost to themselves, advocates of both conservative and liberal individualism can use service to shroud their real intentions in the decent drapery of community feeling. Service, badly conceived, can distance citizens from public problems. Those who serve can help people “out there,” as if the problems “they” have are disconnected from the society in which the server lives. The sociologist Michael Schudson has argued that President Bush’s ideal citizen is a “Rotarian, moved by a sense of neighborliness, Christian charity, and social responsibility, but untouched by having a personal stake in public justice.” His point is not to knock Rotarians. It’s to argue that self-interest in pursuit of justice is a virtue. As Schudson notes in describing the civil rights movement, the most dramatic expansion of democracy and citizenship in our lifetime was brought about by citizens “driven not by a desire to serve but by an effort to overcome indignities they themselves have suffered.” It’s an important point. But it’s also true that Rotarians are good citizens. Neighborliness, charity, and social responsibility are genuine virtues. It is both good and useful to assert, as Rabbi Chaim of Volozhin did, that “my neighbor’s material needs are my spiritual needs.” It’s just possible that a nation responding to the call to service would, over time, become a nation deeply engaged in questions of public justice. The debate over national service is a debate over how we Americans think of ourselves. It’s a debate over how we will solve public problems and what we owe our country and each other. If our nation is to continue to prosper, it’s a debate we will have in every generation. For if we decide there are no public things to which we are willing to pledge some of our time and some of our effort—not to mention “our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor”—then we will have quietly abandoned our nation’s experiment in liberty rooted in mutual assistance and democratic aspiration.

#### Narratives of citizenship has and will continue to be anti-latinx. You are feeding into the pervasive and violent rhetoric that we are forced to succumb to every day, the rhetoric that contributed to the repeal of DACA. The discourse of citizenship continues to live at the borders of just white enough and too deviant.

Orozco-mendoza 08 Borderlands Theory: Producing Border Epistemologies with Gloria Anzald ̇a Elva Fabiola Orozco-Mendoza Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University In partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts In Political science Submitted to Committee members: Dr. Wolfgang Natter, chair Dr. Barbara E. Smith Dr. Antonio Y. Vazquez-Arroyo Dr. Richard D. Shingles April 24, 2008 Blacksburg, Virginia. 25-27– //KAE

One of the goals of modernity8 was to change the obscurantism of the world into reason. During this period, the European civilization expanded all over the world due to the fact that they managed to carry on the social production of frontiers; a concept that according to Walter D. Mignolo and Madina V. Tlostanova was described as a line indicating the last point in the relentless march of civilization. On the one side of the frontiers was civilization; on the other; nothing, just barbarism or emptinessi (Mignolo and Tlostanova, 2006: 205).9 According to this classification, civilization was meant to be a synonym of Western Europe while barbarism was to be understood as the remainder, i.e. Africa, Asia, and America. From this context, then, frontiers became the spaces of influence that Europeans accommodated to exercise control over its periphery on the basis of racist values that led to the establishment of opposing categories such as us and them, or, we and others. With this classification, Europe attempted to appoint itself the center of the world and tried to divide up the earth to organize the world as exploitation and to export the border form to the periphery (Balibar, 2004: 7). Thus, exporting the border form to the periphery not only implied organizing the world in units called nation-states, but it also meant developing a cultural or spiritual nationalism that required citizens to associate the democratic universality of human rights with particular national belonging leading inevitably to systems of exclusion: the divide between populations considered native and those considered foreign, heterogeneous, who are racially or culturally stigmatized (Balibar, 2004: 8). This mechanism was crucial to sustain colonization since colonized people were, obviously, not considered citizens of the imperial government; thereby they should not have access to rights since they were not considered citizens in the first place. Castro-Gomez gives us a similar argument that is worth transcribing at length: Citizenship was not only restricted to men who were married, literate, heterosexual, and proprietors, but also, and especially, to men who were white. In turn, the individuals that fell outside the space of citizenship were not only the homosexuals, prisoners, mental patients and political dissidents Foucault had in mind, but also blacks Indians, mestizos, gypsies, Jews, and now, in terms of globalization, ethnic minorities, immigrants and Auslandern (foreigners) (Castro-Gomez and Johnson, 2000: 513). To be sure, Europeans not only denied colonized people a citizen status but they also classified native people as inhuman, devilish, or even animals, as inscribed in the philosophies predicated by Kant (1764), Hegel (1822), and others who considered that underdevelopment was a characteristic proper of non-Europeans (Natter, 2008). Thus, since colonized people could not be treated as equals, it was quite acceptable to use their labor and land to benefit the colonizers, a belief that has been extended to the present-day, as Mignolo and Tlostanova explain: [T]he rhetoric of modernity (and globalization) of salvation continues to be implemented on the assumption of the inferiority or devilish intentions of the other and, therefore, continues to justify oppression and exploitation as well as the eradication of the difference (Mignolo and Tlostanova, 2006: 206). Change, in the European view, consisted of turning savages into "gentlemen" and of bringing them into civilization. However, until the moment when that change actually happened Europeans did not need to take into account the voice, contributions, and knowledge of the colonized. In that way, the epistemologies of indigenous peoples were shadowed in obscurantism, and reason was considered a characteristic exclusively associated with whiteness, where epistemologies of colored people were denied as such. Accounts of this have been recorded by researchers such as Dwight Conquergood who explains, since the enlightenment project of modernity, the first way of knowing has been preeminent. Marching under the banner of science and reason, it has disqualified and repressed other ways of knowing that are rooted in embodied experience, orality and local contingencies (Conquergood, 2002: 146). On similar lines, we find Mignolo and Tlostanova (2006), who complain that the epistemologies of the colonized were erased from world history, since they held no value in the eyes of Europeans. Thus, the following step in colonization consisted of imposing assimilation into European settler cultures; that is how the Nahuatl and Maya languages were changed into Spanish, the Congolese, Kituba, or Lingala into French, or the Dahomeyan into English. This was also the reason why millions of people were forced to abandon their religion in order to be converted into Christianity. In sum, the culture, traditions, and religion of colonized people were used against them to justify oppression. For instance, the art and writing of the Maya civilization was destroyed under the justification that Maya texts were considered pagan. Similarly, the religious rites and human sacrifices of the Aztec culture were used as a justification for the destruction and subjugation of the Aztec people. Although these events are highly problematic in themselves, there exist additional implications that are more disturbing; namely, the fact that the world inherited from modernity an international system that associates certain identities with specific geographical places, thereby implying the problematic assumption that to say we have an identity is just to say that we have a location in social space, a hermeneutic horizon that is both grounded in a location and an opening or site from which we attempt to know the world (Saldivar, 2007: 344). Saldivar criticizes this argument, since accepting it will be constitutive of geographical determinism,10 which attempts to establish a direct association between the degree of development in a nation, culture, or individual and his geographical location in the globe. So, for instance, it is believed that the reason why there is poverty in Colombia, Venezuela, or the Caribbean is because these countries are located in the south; a region where nature produces food easier than in the north, thus making people in the south lazier and more reluctant to work, create, and innovate. Of course, this version does not take any account of colonial history when attempting to explain the reasons why certain nations are economically more developed than others. In conclusion, modernity implies that ìcertain areas of the planet were [are] designated as the location of the barbarians and of the primitives (Mignolo and Tlostanova, 2006: 205).

#### The alt is to reject the aff and embrace a model of transnational Latinx insurgency. Nationalism continually silences the Latinx voice and confines identity to rigid and problematic notions of being a citizen. Resisting nationalism through narratives of Latinx insurgence is particularly key to destroying normative notions of identity. By embracing the model proposed by the affirmative, we begin deconstructing the problematic structures that dominate national discourse.

Vázquez 11 David J. Vázquez (Associate Professor and Head of English and an affiliated faculty member in the Department of Ethnic Studies. He regularly teaches courses on comparative Latina/o literature, comparative ethnic American literature, Critical Race Theory, Environmental Justice, and 20th Century U.S. Literature. He is also a past director of the Center for Latino and Latin American Studies) “Triangulations: Narrative Strategies for Navigating Latino Identity” Journal of Transnational American Studies, 3(2) 2011 p.24-25 <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/7qb6j174> DOA: 10.13.17 BAO

Reconsidering insurgent nationalism also facilitates a more complete historical, cultural, and social understanding of the development of oppositional consciousness in Latina/o communities. Because the nation mediates (in part) how we experience our identities, it is possible to understand the necessity of asserting national consciousness in firstperson personal narratives. As Puri further notes, the nation serves as an indispensible category for combating the homogenizing forces of globalization and discourses of celebratory hybridity: “Caribbean discourses . . . undo the generalized claim that hybridity and the nation- state are opposed to one another and enable a broader questioning of invocations of a ‘global village’ and the death of the nation- state” (6). Puri makes a useful distinction between transnationalisms, which are devoted to aspects of human societies that cannot be contained within the boundaries of a singular nation- state, and “postnationalism,” which effectively argues that the nation as a political and analytical category is dead. I agree with Puri’s argument that those who celebrate the triumph of the global and transnational by declaring the death of the nation overlook the important ways disempowered communities invoke the nation (as an imagined community, rather than a nation- state) as a strategy for empowerment. While this might be a risky move at a time when many theoretical currents within Latina/o studies are oriented around the transnational, I concur with Puri that reexamining cultural nationalism through current critical and theoretical tools facilitates a better understanding of cultural nationalism as a force that was and may still be productive for aggrieved communities of color in their searches for social justice.18 While Puri’s observations relate to the complex cultural and historical milieu of the Caribbean, I extend her analysis to U.S. Latina/os for several reasons. First— and perhaps most obviously— the history and culture of Dominicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans in the United States is rooted in the Caribbean. Further, as Juan Flores (2009) has recently pointed out, social and regional belonging in Caribbean, Latin American, and other diasporic communities in the United States is more accurately characterized by streams and counterstreams of migration and return rather than by discrete movements of people from the home space to the United States. Perhaps most important for my interests, Latina/os continue to deploy nationalism as a strategy for political empowerment, even in the wake of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the forces of globalization that shape migration, immigration, and the flow of transnational capital. Triangulations thus pays careful attention to how the rhetoric of insurgent nationalism continues to influence how opposition is conceived during the last third of the twentieth century.

#### LatCrit helps to unlock systems of oppression that blur the lines between discursive and material, thus producing the most beneficial environment for knowledge production.

Valdes 12 (Francisco Valdes, Professor of Law and Co-Director, Center for Hispanic and Caribbean Legal Studies, University of Miami School of Law, 4-16-2012, Seattle Journal for Social Justice, Volume 8, Issue 1Fall/Winter 2009 Article 7, “Rebellious Knowledge Production, Academic Activism, & Outsider Democracy: From Principles to Practices in LatCrit Theory, 1995 to 2008”, http://digitalcommons.law.seattleu.edu/sjsj/vol8/iss1/7/, Accessed 7/2/13’, NC)

Finally, the fifth basic contribution in this brief sketch would be the collective or programmatic insistence that “class” and “identity” are not oppositional categories of analysis and action, and instead must be understood as “different” dimensions of the interlocking systems of oppression always under interrogation.91 This approach, in other words, emphasizes that “class” is itself an axis of sociolegal identity and that, as such, it must be incorporated into multidimensional analyses of power in law and society. This approach has tempered the influence of dichotomies between “discursive” and “material” aspects of power based on identity politics92 and has positioned us to better understand how class and other forms of identity are mutually constitutive and mutually reinforcing, both in law and in society. These five sets of contributions, I recognize, delve into areas that have occupied the attention of antisubordination scholars of many stripes. I recognize, also, that these contributions accumulate in the form both of individual texts and of collective or programmatic actions.93 But I hope you will notice in the brief account above that, during the past dozen years, we have carefully crafted a distinctive approach to programmatic, collective knowledge production projects. During these past dozen years, we have programmatically refined previous breakthroughs, even as we organized our work around our own developing sense of democratic ethics and approaches regarding knowledge production and the four interrelated functions of theory mentioned earlier.94 In other words, apart from a straightforward, substantive application of OutCrit tools and concepts to new social or legal terrains, we have reassembled and cohered a legacy we inherited into a distinctive model of critical outsider jurisprudence and praxis. This distinctive model is organized around democratic conceptions and egalitarian practices, and thus we may usefully refer to it as a kind of “outsider democracy” in legal knowledge production.95 However, as with everything else that we do, we did not invent democratic knowledge production. As with everything else that we do, we have striven to learn from past efforts, including those of the Society of American Law Teachers (SALT) and the Law & Society Association (LSA), to mix and match the best from each and then add our own distinctive elements.96

#### Thus the role of the ballot is to vote for the debater that best integrates LatCrit pedagogy

#### Nontraditional forms of discussion are necessary to fight the injustice of Americas oppressive legal system. Only through embracing the “taboo” of debate can LatCrit ideology attempt to persuade the masses. The action of signing neg begins this fight right here in this room.

González et. al 12 Marc-Tizoc González et. al, 2012, J.D. University of California Berkeley and Assistant Professor of Law at St. Thomas University School of Law, Seattle Journal for Social Justice, “Afterword: Change and Continuity: An Introduction to the LatCrit Taskforce Recommendations” http://digitalcommons.law.seattleu.edu/sjsj/vol8/iss1/12/

In the Coming Insurrection, the Invisible Committee reminds us that it is useless to wait for a catastrophe or the collapse of civilization to do something. The social and political catastrophe and the collapse of civilization is here, all that remains is for us to choose sides.41 For more than thirteen years, LatCrit has created a critical space that enables scholars and activists alike to choose sides against a longstanding legacy of oppression and exploitation. LatCrit has created a vibrant alternative space that offers the possibility for renewed community and coalition-building projects to continue to challenge the status quo. Today, we invite a collective dialogue that is also anchored on self-critical contributions. We invite a transparent debate, where nothing remains as “taboo,” and where we are all willing to assume principled responsibility over our actions. We also invite participants in this dialogue to engage in honest and transparent dialogue with the goal of contributing to the building of stronger communities and coalitions that can help us take sides against the tyrannical legacies of oppressive regimes and subordinating traditions. We invite participants to help us perpetuate a space where community and coalition building make it possible to take sides against oppression and exploitation. This invitation is also premised on a shared belief that critical coalitions need to move beyond the narrow confines of the legal academy and the ideological constraints presented by legal institutions. We invite participants to explore forms of praxis that draw upon local activists and community members, from the intersection of other disciplinary epistemologies, and from global sources that transgress nationalist ideologies. We invite current and future board members to consider the possibility of transgressing tradition and stepping into a fragile, fragmented, and strange future. We invite all participants in the LatCrit project to consider new possibilities and new directions for future projects.

\*“Snake Tongue” Meztli 2015 https://hellopoetry.com/poem/1146824/snake-tongue/