# **New 1AC 😎**

**Definitions:**

**UsLegal.com defines appropriation as “the taking of private property”**

[**https://definitions.uslegal.com/a/appropriation-eminent-domain/**](https://definitions.uslegal.com/a/appropriation-eminent-domain/)

**Historically, the westward blitz by Americans after independence caused the slaughter of thousands of natives. When they reached Mexican regions in modern day texas and california, it was treated no differently. President James Polk justified the colonization and war against Mexicans saying they “invaded our territory and shed American blood on American soil” after sending 11 of his own men to die in a battle on disputed territory. Once they slaughtered us, they appropriated disputed territory and claimed it was theirs.**

**This same logic is lurking in the resolution as the taking of private property is rooted in colonialism and American imperialism. We must use the resolution as a tool to explore settler logic, and a weapon to destroy it.**

**Because appropriation leads to private property it inherently creates and sustains borders.**

**THUS I AFFIRM THAT THE APPROPRIATION OF OUTER SPACE BY PRIVATE ENTITIES IS UNJUST AS IT WILL CREATE BORDERS. WE MUST KEEP BORDERS FROM BEING CREATED AND DESTROY ALREADY CREATED BORDERS  WE ACHIEVE THIS BY ENACTING ANZALDUA’S NARRATIVES AS A MEANS TO ENACT THE MESTIZA CONSCIOUSNESS**

**Anzaldúa 87’**

In the Borderlands

you are the battleground

where enemies are kin to each other;

you are at home, a stranger,

the border disputes have been settled

the volley of shots have shattered the truce

you are wounded, lost in action

dead, fighting back;

To live in the Borderlands means

the mill with the razor white teeth wants to shred off

your olive-red skin, crush the kernel, your heart

pound you pinch you roll you out

smelling like white bread but dead;

To survive the Borderlands

you must live *sin fronteras*

be a crossroads.

#### **By enacting the Mestiza Consciousness, that is, by breaking down our conceptualization of borders. You give power to the oppressed people to reach social change. This is the solvency in this round. Orozco-mendoza 08**

Orozco-Mendoza, Elva Fabiola. Borderlands theory: producing border epistemologies with Gloria Anzaldua. Diss. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 2008.

**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. 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 ìa new value systemî** (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 54 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

#### **The borderlands are inhabited by those constantly rejected by normative society. It is a vague and undetermined space where social hierarchies and predisposed concepts of structure do not presuppose the world. Orozco-Mendoza 2**

In this section, we confront the most difficult aspects of the Borderlands theory since we are dealing with Borderlands that are socially constructed. This characteristic makes their awareness problematic because pointing them out is not as simple as in the case of physical borders. In order to depict emotional and ideological Borderlands one has to look at fixed structures of power, i.e., state officials, dominant culture, economic and political elites. **Borderlands are experienced when people are confronted with the fact that they are constantly rejected by means of their color, sexual preference, class, or gender. Ideological Borderlands may be present when the social hierarchies presuppose that the world is composed by rigid and definite categories of superiority and inferiority, where superiority** is commonly associated with folks who are **white**, **Christian, middle or upper classes while inferiority is related to those who fall outside of the previous category and are considered different or defective**. Anzald˙aís definition of Borderlands states that ìa **Borderland is a vague and undetermined place created by the emotional residue of an unnatural boundary where the prohibited, the forbidden and los atravesados reside in a place of discomfort as they negotiate between the conflicting forces** in such marginsî (Aigner-Varoz, 2000: 49). **The Borderland is produced by feelings of alienation and discomfort with the dominant culture that denies ìothersî as equals and rejects them for all that they represent**. However the Borderlands is not only a space created by peopleís discomfort, it is something else.

#### **The reading of Anzaldua’s work we are keeping them alive and meaningful. This provides us unique solvency, she wrote...**

Gloria **Anzaldua**, former Professor at San Francisco State University and leading scholar in [Chicano](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chicano) cultural theory and [Queer theory](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Queer_theory). (**1987**) Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza DJL

My "stories" are acts encapsulated in time, "enacted" every time they are spoken aloud or read silently. I like to think of them as performances and not as inert and "dead" objects (as the aesthetics of Western culture think of art works). Instead, the work has an identity; it is a "who" or a "what" and contains the presences of persons, that is, incarnations of gods or ancestors or natural and cosmic powers. The work manifests the same needs as a person, it needs to be "fed," la tengo que baiiar y vestir.

## **Advantage: inclusion of people of color**

#### **The marginalization of Hispanic literature and spirit-phobia directed towards women of color silences her voice in any academic setting. We need to enact her narratives and create space for the voice of the Chicana Queer Women to be heard. Keating 2**

Keating, AnaLouise. "" I'm a citizen of the universe": Gloria Anzaldúa's Spiritual Activism as Catalyst for Social Change." *Feminist Studies* (2008): 53-69.

#### **This academic spirit-phohia has affected Anzaldúan scholarship in several interrelated ways: We might admire Anzaldúa's hold spirit vision yet fear that if we explore it in our work, we will harm our careers**. Not only will our colleagues scoff at us, but we will have difficulty publishing such explorations. **As Lara suggests, these fears can be intensified for Chicanas and other women of colors who are often already viewed as interlopers in the academy.' Or, we might appreciate Anzaldúa's spiritual activism yet worry that if we try to discuss it in print, our colleagues will re-evaluate her writings in negative ways** and reject her theoretical contrihutions as "New Age,"\* escapist ramhlings. Or, we might be suspicious of Anzaldúa's references to spirits and souls, question her discussions of precolonial traditions, and discredit her theoretical and philosophical achievements. Thus, for example, one reader interprets Borderlands I La Frontera: The New Mestiza as Anzaldúa's attempt "[t]o return to the 'traditional' spiritualities that were in place before the arrival of Cortés." **According to this scholar, "Anzaldúa's language, her grammar, her talk are ultimately completely mortgaged to a nostalgia that I find unacceptable.** The resurrection of the old gods (be they 'white' or 'indigenous') is a futile and impossible task. To invoke old gods as a tool against oppression and capitalism is to choose the wrong weapon."**'**

**This marginalization is a key component of the oppressive epistemology of eurocentrism. Failure to consider location perpetuates destructive hierarchies of knowledge**

**Grosfoguel in 2k5** (Ramon, associate professor in the department of ethnic studies at the university of California at Berkeley, Critical Globalization Studies, edited by Richard Appelbaum and William Robinson)

The first point to be examined is the contribution of ethnic studies to epistemological questions. The hegemonic Eurocentric paradigm that has informed Western philosophy and sciences in the modern—colonial capitalist, patriarchal world-system for the last 500 years assumes a universalistic, neutral, objective point of view. Chicana and black feminist scholars (Moraga and Anzaldua, 1983) as well as Third World scholars inside and outside the United States (Mignolo, 2000) reminded us that we always speak from a particular location in the power structures. Nobody escapes the class, sexual, gender, spiritual, geographical, and racial hierarchies of the modern—colonial capitalist world-system. As feminist scholar Donna Haraways (1988) states, our knowledges are always situated. Black feminist scholars called this perspective standpoint epistemology (Collins, 1990), whereas Latin American philosopher of liberation Enrique Dussel called it the "geopolitics of knowledge" (Dussel, 1977). This is not only a question about social values in knowledge production or the fact that our knowledge is always partial. The main point here is the locus of enunciation, that is, the geopolitical location of the subject that speaks. In Western philosophy and sciences, the subject that speaks is always hidden, concealed, erased from the analysis. Ethnic location and epistemic location are always decoupled. By delinking ethnic location from epistemic location, Western philosophy and sciences are able to produce a myth about universalist knowledge that covers up, that is, conceals who is speaking, as well as the geopolitical location in the structures of power from which the subject speaks. This is what the Colombian philosopher Santiago Castro-Gomez called the "point zero" perspective of Eurocentric philosophies (Castro-Gomez, 2003). The "point zero" is the point of view that hides and conceals itself as being beyond a particular point of view, that is, the point of view that represents itself as being without a point of view. It is this god's-eye view that always hides its local and particular perspective under a universal perspective. Historically, this has allowed Western man (the gendered term is intentionally used here) to represent his knowledge as the only knowledge capable of achieving a universal consciousness, and to dismiss non-Western knowledge as particularistic and, thus, unable to achieve universality. This strategy has been crucial for Western global designs. By hiding the location of the subject of enunciation, European/Euro-American colonial expansion and domination was able to construct a hierarchy of superior and inferior knowledge and, thus, of superior and inferior people around the world. We went from the sixteenth-century characterization of "people without writing" to the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century characterization of "people without history," then to the twentieth-century characterization of "people without development." We went from the sixteenth-century "rights of people" to the eighteenth-century "rights of man," and to the late-twentieth-century "human rights." All of these are part of global designs articulated to the simultaneous production and reproduction of an international division of labor of core—periphery that overlaps with the global racial—ethnic hierarchy of European and non-European. What is the implication of this epistemological critique to our knowledge production and to our concept of capitalism? <283-284>

#### **Rigid monolithic identities reified by status quo identity movements only recreate the oppressive structures they seek to destroy. The Intersectional construct of identity set forward by Anzaldua provides a holistic perspective able to evade fixed powers. Keating 3**

Anzaldúa's self-positioning in the above epigraph represents a startling contrast to conventional models of identity. **Usually, self-identification functions through exclusion and binary opposition: we define who and what we are by defining who and what we are not. These exclusionary identities occur within a restrictive framework that marks, divides, and segregates human beings based on narrow, dualistic models of difference**. As Patricia Hill Collins explains, **"In either/or dichotomous thinking, difference is defined in oppositional terms. One part is not simply different from its counterpart; it is inherently opposed to its 'other.' Whites and Blacks, males and females, thought and feeling, are not complementary counterparts—they are fundamentally different entities related only through their definitions as opposites.'"\* This oppositional logic reduces our interactional possibilities to two mutually exclusive options:** Either we are entirely the same or we are entirely different. In this either/or system, difference becomes rigidly divisive. **When we view ourselves and others through this binary lens, we assume that our differences are too different— too *other,* as it were-to have *anything* of importance in common with those whom we have defined as our others. Such stark either/or assumptions leave no room for the messy complexities of compromise and exchange so vital to coalition work and community-building**. **Anzaldúa**'s spiritual activism **offers a different approach, one bypassing this exclusionary logic**. As she explains in her introduction to *this bridge we call home: radical visions for trartsformation,* **"Many of us identify with groups and social positions not limited to our ethnic, racial, religious, class, gender, or national classifications. Though most people self-define by what they exclude, we define who we are by what we include—what I call the new tribalism."" Significantly, Anzaldúa does not discount the importance of gender, ethnicity/'race,' sexuality, ability, and other identity related components**. However, **she maintains that these conventional categories are too restrictive and cannot adequately define us. Indeed, she suggests that these identity-based categories have been and still are used to disempower and oppress us: "the changeability of racial, gender, sexual, and other categories render[s] the conventional labelings obsolete. Though these markings are outworn and inaccurate, those in power continue using them to single out and negate those who are 'different' because of color, language, notions of reality, or other diversity."^" When we base our assessments of others entirely—or even primarily—on their physical appearances and social locations, we make biased, inaccurate assumptions about their pohtics, worldviews, and so forth**. When we act on these assumptions (as we too often do), we unnecessarily close ourselves off from potential allies. Or as Anzaldúa so eloquently asserts, "For the politically correct stance we let color, class, and gender separate us from those who would be kindred spirits. So the walls grow higher, the gulfs between us wider, the silences more profound."^' **Positing radical interconnectedness, Anzaldúa dismantles these walls by building bridges. She adopts flexible, context-specific perspectives enabling her simultaneously to see and see through exclusionary identity classifications. She does not ignore the importance of color, class, gender, and other identity markers; however, she puts these classifications into a more holistic perspective**. As in my epigraph to this section, she defines each person as a part of a larger whole—a "cosmic ocean, the soul, or whatever." By so doing, Anzaldúa can insist on a commonality shared by all human beings, a commonality we share despite the very real differences among us**. For Anzaldúa, this "common factor" goes beyond—but *does not* Ignore—identities based on gender, 'race,' or other systems of difference; it is "wider than any social position or racial label**." Indeed, Anzaldúa locates this identity factor within nonhuman life as well. As she explains, "Your identity has roots you share with all people and other beings—spirit, feeling, and body comprise a greater identity category. The body is rooted in the earth, la tierra itself. You meet ensoulment in trees, in woods, in streams."^^ It's important to note that for Anzaldúa this shared identity factor does not make us identical. As I use tbe term, "**commonality" and "sameness" are not synonymous. Anzaldúa's commonalities are heterogeneous and multifaceted**.

**Thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for whoever provides the best survival method to alleviate and deconstruct violence, prefer because the debate space is a site for resisting structural violence. It is a space where students build advocacy skills. There’s no such thing as fiat and plans aren’t passed just because we think it could, that means the only valuable thing that can come from the round is how to build resistance against oppression.**