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\*

We come home to a family of 6 living in a house for 3

We come home to empty promises and hollow hope

We come home to children who learn to smile and laugh so they aren’t thinking about their hunger pains

So how the hell am I going to tell those kids to serve their nation

The same nation that is telling them they aren’t welcome

The nation that said go home

Brought them crying to their knees

Asking if their father will still be home when they get there

Asking why he got called all those mean things by the man this nation deemed a leader

Telling us we haven’t served

But we have

And we always will

As long as ignorance prevails

As long as our voices are silenced

As long as being an American citizen is the highest metric for life

And serving the elite is the highest metric for citizenship

This is not a question

This is a demand to look at us and hear us

Acknowledge we exist outside of our capacity to work

We are not here to serve you

We are not here for you at all

#### Narratives of citizenship have been and will continue to be anti-Latinx. The resolution is 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. The resolution is a personification of the American frontier, it exists 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.

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 emptiness (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 United States has a history of viewing race relations as a black and white issue. This papers over Latinx oppression. As if forcing us to work for you wasn’t enough, the liberating discourse keeps us out. The aff won’t let us be kept out anymore.

Alcoff 10 Linda Martín Alcoff, (Professor of Philosophy at Hunter College and the CUNY Graduate Center), “Latinos Beyond the Binary,” 3-02-2010 <http://www.alcoff.com/content/beyondbinary.html> DOA: 10.12.17

Contradictory binaries flourish in climates where simplifications are preferred over complex analysis. The idea that a black/white racial binary can account for all forms of racism in the United States is an example of such a pernicious simplification, as well as the idea that Latinos, or whites, have homogeneous political effects on our shared public culture. In this paper I want to redress such simplifications by developing three concepts that are especially relevant for understanding the conditions of Latinos in the U.S. The first concept is anti-Latino racism, as a specific form of racism distinct in some regards to antiblack racism and thus lost in racial discourses that remain exclusively focused on the black-white binary. The second concept is ethnorace, a hybridized identity category that bridges racial and ethnic categories and enhances our ability to conceptualize the treatment of most if not all Latinos in the U.S.. And the third concept involves an expansion of identity categories--ethnic and racial and ethno-racial—that I argue will help us to understand the economic and political realities and transformations in the current era. Each concept offers an alternative to binaries either through a larger set of conceptual resources or through transcending given binaries in a bridge concept. But the overall point is that, as we address each of these issues, the binary of threat and promise should counsel against unified political projections, as if we could empower only one set of forces in this tug of war. We need, rather, to chart the likely contradictory effects of every step that is taken.

#### Deployment of Latinidad scholarship ruptures binary constructions of identity; injecting hybrid identity into discourses of race is key to break down the black-white binary and explode dualisms.

Valdivia 04 Angharad N. Valdivia, Spring-xx-2004, Ph.D., Department Head of Media and Cinema Studies, Interim Director of Institute of Communications Research, Research Professor of Communications, Professor of Media Studies, Professor of Latina/o Studies, Professor in the Unit for Criticism and Interpretive Theory, Professor in the Gender and Women's Studies Program @ University of Illinois, “Latinas as Radical Hybrid: Transnationally gendered traces in mainstream media,” <http://lass.purduecal.edu/cca/gmj/sp04/gmj-sp04-valdivia.htm>

Yet the presence of Latinas and Latinidad also speaks to broader epistemological issues of ethnic studies. Whereas concepts of ethnicity, in relation to concepts of race, speak to cultural markers of identity, they still attempt to locate ethnic difference as a marker of difference. Shohat’s "ethnicities in relation" approach (1991) posits ethnicities, especially as represented in film and other mass media, as dynamic and unstable, gaining meaning something only in terms of the representation of other ethnicities within a given textual context. Latinas, of course, can be examined in this relational framework. Fitting somewhere between black and whiteness in the national imaginary (Davis, 2000), Latinas as a constructed category gain meaning by virtue of their supposed location as an in between ethnicity, not white yet not black. Yet this is not a simple process as the fact is Latinas are not uniformly brown. To further explore this category and its implications for media and popular culture representation we must turn to theories of hybridity. The concept of hybridity is extremely useful to communications scholars for a number of reasons yet remains to be fully utilized by our interdiscipline (Kraidy, 1999, 2002; Murphy and Kraidy, 2003). Kraidy (2002: 317) proposes that we foreground this concept as it: "needs to be understood as a communicative practice constitutive of, and constituted by, sociopolitical and economic arrangements" that are "complex, processual, and dynamic." Scholars from many disciplinary backgrounds have been seriously engaged in the potential of the concept of hybridity (e.g. Avtar and Coombs, 2000; Joseph and Fink, 1999; Werbner and Modood, 1997) within the humanities and social sciences.[i] Beyond its merely descriptive uses, hybridity also opens up the space for the study of cultural negotiations, conflicts, and struggles against the backdrop of contemporary globalization (Shome and Hegde, 2002a; 2002b). The concept is foremost a rejection of essentialist notions, either of gender or of ethnicity and race, as well as an acknowledgement that there is no purity to be found either at the level of culture, the body, blood, or DNA. Kraniaskaus (2000) differentiates between García Canclini’s (1995) socio-cultural hybridity and Bhabha’s (1994) more literary and psychoanalytic approach. Yet both Canclini and Bhabha counter more simplistic versions of globalization studies where a celebratory mish mash of people and cultures are offered, and all difference is erased. To some hybridity might suggest a playful space, where one can try on different identities. Indeed studies of contemporary ethnicity (Dávila, 2001; Halter, 2000; Moorti, 2003) suggest that hybrid traces are very useful for commodification purposes and the marketing of ethnicity. In fact ethnic ambiguity is a most useful strategy as it has the potential of speaking to different segments of the audience with one economical image or set of images. As such hybridity and its accompanying strategy, representational ambiguity, certainly have their uses within late capitalism.

#### 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 reading the affirmative 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.

#### 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

#### I advocate that we embrace a model of transnational Latinx insurgency in order to critically interrogate the concept of national service as provided by the resolution

#### 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.

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