#### Debate is an extension of the project of immigration and deportation – communication is not a level playing field but rather built to exclude the people who don’t fit within its paradigm. Because movements to liberate through reform start with the image of English centricity, that reform will never be safe for the immigrant – your roll is to embrace Spanish as the esoteric code to destroy debate

**Conquergood 1**, Performance Studies: Interventions and Radical Research, Dwight Conquergood, TDR (1988-) Vol. 46, No. 2 (Summer, 2002), pp. 145-156 (12 pages) Published by: [The MIT Press](https://www.jstor.org/publisher/mitpress) SJDH

**The state of emergency under which many people live demands that we pay attention to messages that are coded and encrypted; to indirect, nonverbal, and extralinguistic modes of communication where subversive meanings and utopian yearnings can be sheltered and shielded from surveillance. In his study of the oppositional politics of black musical performance, Paul Gilroy argues that critical scholars need to move beyond this "idea and ideology of the text and of textuality as a mode of communicative practice which provides a model for all other forms of cognitive exchange and social interaction"** (I994:77). Oppressed people everywhere must watch their backs, cover their tracks, suck up their feelings, and veil their meanings. **The state of emergency under which many people live demands that we pay attention to messages that are coded and encrypted; to indirect, nonverbal, and extralinguistic modes of communication where subversive meanings and utopian yearnings can be sheltered and shielded from surveillance.** Gilroy's point is illustrated vividly by Frederick Douglass in a remarkable pas- sage from his life narrative in which he discussed the improvisatory performance politics expressed in the singing of enslaved people. It is worth quoting at length:3 But, on allowance day, those who visited the great house farm were peculiarly excited and noisy. While on their way, they would make the dense old woods, for miles around, reverberate with their wild notes. These were not always merry because they were wild. On the contrary, they were mostly of a plaintive cast, and told a tale of grief and sorrow. In the most boisterous outbursts of rapturous sentiment, there was ever a tinge of deep melancholy [...]. I have sometimes thought that the mere hearing of those songs would do more to impress truly spiritual-minded men and women with the soul-crushing and death-dealing character of slavery, than the reading of whole volumes [...]. Every tone was a testimony against slavery [...]. The hearing of those wild notes always [...] filled my heart with ineffable sadness [...]. To those songs I trace my first glimmering conceptions of the dehumanizing character of slavery [...]. Those songs still follow me, to deepen my hatred of slavery, and quicken my sympa- thies for my brethren in bonds. ([1855] 1969:97-99) Enslaved people were forbidden by law in Igth-century America to acquireedged the deeply felt insights and revelatory power that come through the em- bodied experience of listening to communal singing, the tones, cadence, vocal nuances, all the sensuous specificities of performance that overflow verbal content: "they were tones loud, long, and deep" (99). In order to know the deep meaning of slavery, Douglass recommended an experiential, participatory epistemology as superior to the armchair "reading of whole volumes." Douglass advised meeting enslaved people on the ground of their experience by exposing oneself to their expressive performances. In this way, Douglass anticipated and extended Johannes Fabian's call for a turn "from informative to performative ethnography" (1990:3), an ethnography of the ears and heart that reimagines participant-observation as coperformative witnessing: If any one wishes to be impressed with a sense of the soul-killing power of slavery, let him go to Colonel Lloyd's plantation, and, on allowance day, place himself in the deep pine woods, and there let him, in silence, thoughtfully analyze the sounds that shall pass through the chambers of his soul, and if he is not thus impressed, it will only be because "there is no flesh in his obdurate heart." (Douglass [1855] 1969:99) Instead of reading textual accounts of slavery, Douglass recommended a riskier hermeneutics of experience, relocation, copresence, humility, and vulnerability: listening to and being touched by the protest performances of enslaved people. He understood that knowledge is located, not transcendent ("let him go" and "place himself in the deep pine woods, and there [...]"); that it must be engaged, not abstracted ("let him [...] analyze the sounds that shall pass through the chambers of his soul"); and that it is forged from solidarity with, not separation from, the people ("quicken my sympathies for my brethren in bonds"). In this way, Doug- lass's epistemology prefigured Antonio Gramsci's call for engaged knowledge: **"The intellectual's error consists in believing that one can know without under- standing and even more without feeling and being impassioned** [...] that is, with- out feeling the elementary passions of the people" (I97I:418). **Proximity, not objectivity, becomes an epistemological point of departure and return**. Douglass recommended placing oneself quietly, respectfully, humbly, in the space of others so that one could be surrounded and "impressed" by the expressive meanings of their music. It is subtle but significant that he instructed the outsider to listen "in silence." I interpret this admonition as an acknowledgment and subversion of the soundscapes of power within which the ruling classes typically are listened to while the subordinate classes listen in silence. **Anyone who had the liberty to travel freely would be, of course, on the privileged side of domination and silencing that these songs evoked and contested. In effect, Douglass encouraged a participatory understanding of these performances, but one that muffled white privilege.** Further, because overseers often commanded enslaved people to sing in the fields as a way of auditing their labor, and plantation rulers even appropriated after-work performances for their own amusement, Douglass was keenly sensitive to how one approached and entered subjugated spaces of performance. The mise-en-sc&ne of feeling-understanding-knowing for Douglass is radically different from the interpretive scene set forth by Clifford Geertz in what is now a foundational and frequently cited quotation for the world-as-text model in ethnography and cultural studies: "The culture of a people is an ensemble of texts, themselves ensembles, which the anthropologist strains to read over the shoulders of those to whom they properly belong" (1973:452). Whereas Douglass featured cultural performances that register and radiate dynamic "structures of feeling" and pull us into alternative ways of knowing that exceed cognitive control(Williams 1977), Geertz figures culture as a stiff, awkward reading room. The ethnocentrism of this textualist metaphor is thrown into stark relief when applied to the countercultures of enslaved and other dispossessed people. Forcibly excluded from acquiring literacy, enslaved people nonetheless created a culture of resistance. **Instead of an "ensemble of texts," however, a repertoire of performance practices became the backbone of this counterculture where politics was "played, danced, and acted, as well as sung and sung about, because words [...] will never be enough to communicate its unsayable claims to truth"** (Gilroy 1994:37). In addition to the ethnocentrism of the culture-is-text metaphor, Geertz's theory needs to be critiqued for its particular fieldwork-as-reading model: "Doing ethnography is like trying to read [...] a manuscript" (Io). **Instead of listening, absorbing, and standing in solidarity with the protest performances of the people, as Douglass recommended, the ethnographer, in Geertz's scene, stands above and behind the people and, uninvited, peers over their shoulders to read their texts, like an overseer or a spy**. There is more than a hint of the improper in this scene: **the asymmetrical power relations secure both the anthropologist's privilege to intrude and the people's silent acquiescence (although one can imagine what they would say about the anthropologist's manners and motives when they are outside his reading gaze)**. The strain and tension of this scene are not mediated by talk or interaction; both the researcher and the researched face the page as silent readers instead of turning to face one another and, perhaps, open a conversation.

#### By reifying the idea that English is the only valid language with which a we can perform, debate creates the distinction between what is the immigrant and the citizen. Our people are deemed illiterate – the only form of linguistic education they get is when a piece of paper is given to them warranting their arrest.
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According to Michel de Certeau, "what the map cuts up, the story cuts across" (1984:129). This pithy phrase evokes a postcolonial world crisscrossed by trans- national narratives, diaspora affiliations, and, especially, the movement and mul- tiple migrations of people, sometimes voluntary, but often economically propelled and politically coerced. In order to keep pace with such a world, we now think of "place" as a heavily trafficked intersection, a port of call and exchange, instead of a circumscribed territory. A boundary is more like a membrane than a wall. In current cultural theory, "location" is imagined as an itinerary instead of a fixed point. Our understanding of "local context" expands to encompass the historical, dynamic, often traumatic, movements of people, ideas, images, commodities, and capital. It is no longer easy to sort out the local from the global: transnational circulations of images get reworked on the ground and redeployed for local, tactical struggles. And global flows simultaneously are encumbered and energized by these local makeovers. We now are keenly aware that the "local" is a leaky, contingent construction, and that global forces are taken up, struggled over, and refracted for site-specific purposes. The best of the new cultural theory distinguishes itself from apolitical celebrations of mobility, flow, and easy border crossings by carefully tracking the transitive circuits of power and the political economic pressure points that monitor the migrations of people, channel the circulations of meanings, and stratify access to resources (see Gilroy 1994; Ap- padurai 1996; Lavie and Swedenburg 1996; Clifford I997; di Leonardo 1998; Joseph 1999; Ong I999). We now ask: For whom is the border a friction-free zone of entitled access, a frontier of possibility? Who travels confidently across borders, and who gets questioned, detained, interrogated, and strip-searched at the border (see Taylor I999)? But de Certeau's aphorism, "what the map cuts up, the story cuts across," also points to transgressive travel between two different domains of knowledge: one official, objective, and abstract-"the map"; the other one practical, embodied, and popular-"the story." This promiscuous traffic between different ways of knowing carries the most radical promise of performance studies research. Performance studies struggles to open the space between analysis and action, and to pull the pin on the binary opposition between theory and practice. This embrace of different ways of knowing is radical because it cuts to the root of how knowledge is organized in the academy. The dominant way of knowing in the academy is that of empirical observation and critical analysis from a distanced perspective: "knowing that," and "knowing about." This is a view from above the object of inquiry: knowledge that is an- chored in paradigm and secured in print. This propositional knowledge is shad- owed by another way of knowing that is grounded in active, intimate, hands-on participation and personal connection: "knowing how," and "knowing who." This is a view from ground level, in the thick of things. This is knowledge that is anchored in practice and circulated within a performance community, but is ephemeral. Donna Haraway locates this homely and vulnerable "view from a body" in contrast to the abstract and authoritative "view from above," universal knowledge that pretends to transcend location (1991:196). Dominant epistemologies that link knowing with seeing are not attuned to meanings that are masked, camouflaged, indirect, em- bedded, or hidden in context. Since the enlightenment project of modernity, the first way of knowing has been preeminent. **Marching under the banner of science and reason, it has dis- qualified and repressed other ways of knowing that are rooted in embodied ex- perience, orality, and local contingencies**. Between objective knowledge that is consolidated in texts, and local know-how that circulates on the ground within a community of memory and practice, there is no contest. It is the choice between science and "old wives' tales" (note how the disqualified knowledge is gendered as feminine). Michel Foucault coined the term "subjugated knowledges" to include all the local, regional, vernacular, naive knowledges at the bottom of the hierarchy- the low Other of science (I980:81-84). These are the nonserious ways of knowing that dominant culture neglects, excludes, represses, or simply fails to recognize. Subjugated knowledges have been erased because they are illegible; they exist, by and large, as active bodies of meaning, outside of books, eluding the forces of inscription that would make them legible, and thereby legitimate (see de Certeau 1998; Scott 1998). What gets squeezed out by this epistemic violence is the whole realm of complex, finely nuanced meaning that is embodied, tacit, intoned, gestured, impro- vised, coexperienced, covert-and all the more deeply meaningful because of its refusal to be spelled out. Dominant epistemologies that link knowing with seeing are not attuned to meanings that are masked, camouflaged, indirect, embedded, or hidden in context. The visual/verbal bias of Western regimes of knowledge blinds researchers to meanings that are expressed forcefully through intonation, silence, body tension, arched eyebrows, blank stares, and other protective arts of disguise and secrecy-what de Certeau called "the elocutionary experience of a fugitive communication" (2000:133; see Conquergood 2000). Subordinate people do not have the privilege of explicitness, the luxury of transparency, the presumptive norm of clear and direct communication, free and open debate on a level playing field that the privileged classes take for granted. In his critique of the limitations of literacy, Kenneth Burke argued that print- based scholarship has built-in blind spots and a conditioned deafness: The [written] record is usually but a fragment of the expression (as the written word omits all telltale record of gesture and tonality; and not onlymay our "literacy" keep us from missing the omissions, it may blunt us to the appreciation of tone and gesture, so that even when we witness the full expression, we note only those aspects of it that can be written down). ([1950] 1969:185) In even stronger terms, Raymond Williams challenged the class-based arrogance of scriptocentrism, pointing to the "error" and "delusion" of "highly educated" people who are "so driven in on their reading" that "they fail to notice that there are other forms of skilled, intelligent, creative activity" such as "theatre" and "active politics." This error "resembles that of the narrow reformer who supposes that farm labourers and village craftsmen were once uneducated, merely because they could not read." He argued that "the contempt" for performance and prac- tical activity, "which is always latent in the highly literate, is a mark of the ob- server's limits, not those of the activities themselves" ([1958] I983:309). Williams critiqued scholars for limiting their sources to written materials; I agree with Burke that scholarship is so skewed toward texts that even when researchers do attend to extralinguistic human action and embodied events they construe them as texts to be read. According to de Certeau, this scriptocentrism is a hallmark of Western imperialism. Posted above the gates of modernity, this sign: "'Here only what is written is understood.' Such is the internal law of that which has constituted itself as 'Western' [and 'white']" (1984:161). **Only middle-class academics could blithely assume that all the world is a text because reading and writing are central to their everyday lives and occupational security**. **For many people throughout the world, however, particularly subaltern groups, texts are often inaccessible, or threatening, charged with the regulatory powers of the state. More often than not, subordinate people experience texts and the bureaucracy of literacy as instruments of control and displacement, e.g., green cards, passports, arrest warrants, deportation orders-what de Certeau calls "intextuation**": "Every power, including the power of law, is written first of all on the backs of its subjects" (I984:I40). **Among the most oppressed people in the United States today are the "undocumented" immigrants, the so-called "il- legal aliens," known in the vernacular as the people "sin papeles," the people without papers, indocumentado/as. They are illegal because they are not legible, they trouble "the writing machine of the law**" (de Certeau 1984:I4I). The hegemony of textualism needs to be exposed and undermined. Transcrip-tion is not a transparent or politically innocent model for conceptualizing or engaging the world. The root metaphor of the text underpins the supremacy of Western knowledge systems by erasing the vast realm of human knowledge and meaningful action that is unlettered, "a history of the tacit and the habitual" (Jackson 2000:29). In their multivolume historical ethnography of colonialism/ evangelism in South Africa, John and Jean Comaroffpay careful attention to the way Tswana people argued with their white interlocutors "both verbally and nonverbally" (1997:47; see also 1991). They excavate spaces of agency and struggle from everyday performance practices-clothing, gardening, healing, trading, worshipping, architecture, and homemaking-to reveal an impressive repertoire of conscious, creative, critical, contrapuntal responses to the imperialist project that exceeded the verbal. The Comaroffs intervene in an academically fashionable textual fundamentalism and fetish of the (verbal) archive where "text-a sad proxy for life-becomes all" (1992:26). "In this day and age," they ask, "do we still have to remind ourselves that many of the players on any historical stage cannot speak at all? Or, under greater or lesser duress, opt not to do so" (1997:48; see also Scott I99o)? There are many ethnographic examples of how nonelite people recognize the opacity of the text and critique its dense occlusions and implications in historical processes of political economic privilege and systematic exclusion. In Belize, forexample, Garifuna people, an African-descended minority group, use the word gapencillitin, which means "people with pencil," to refer to middle- and upper- class members of the professional-managerial class, elites who approach life from an intellectual perspective. They use the word mapencillitin, literally "people with- out pencil," to refer to rural and working-class people, "real folks" who approach life from a practitioner's point of view.2 What is interesting about the Garifuna example is that **class stratification, related to differential knowledges, is articulated in terms of access to literacy. The pencil draws the line between the haves and the have-nots.** For Garifuna people, **the pencil is not a neutral instrument; it functions metonymically as the operative technology of a complex political economy of knowledge, power, and the exclusions upon which privilege is based**.

#### Debate is just like any other classroom – where the threat of immigration seeks to strike fear into us. The duty of the judge is to do what is good for the kids, not the activity

**Villarreal 19**, Rosario Quiroz Villarreal (educator, policy entrepreneur at the Next100, a startup think-tank for progressive policy) When a Student Says, ‘The President Is Going to Take My Parents Away', 8/8/2019, educationpost, https://educationpost.org/when-a-student-says-the-president-is-going-to-take-my-parents-away/

**In my fourth-grade classroom in Houston, Texas, the morning after Election Day 2016 was quiet.** As students filed into the classroom, I asked them to make a circle on the rug to talk through the question, “How are you feeling today?” My most charismatic, happy-go-lucky student broke into tears. “The president is going to take my parents away, Miss! What am I going to do?” My stomach tensed in the face of the question I’d been dreading. **Other students chimed in with similar fears and concerns for themselves and their families**. My students, 9- and 10-year-old children, should not be concerned with being separated from their caregivers. They should have a caring and supportive environment in which they can focus on their learning. But that’s not the reality they’re currently allowed. On the contrary, **children from immigrant families, including approxi mately 4.1 million U.S. citizen children living with an undocumented parent, are now immersed in a web of toxic stress. They are surrounded by news of children like them in cages, separated from their parents. They hear repeated threats of mass deportation raids. And they know that ICE agents have increasingly targeted immigrants moving to and from schools, hospitals and churches. his culture of fear clearly affects schools. Just yesterday in Forest, Mississippi, ICE agents arrested nearly 700 immigrant workers in one of the largest single immigration sweeps in history. These raids left children stranded, without parents—devastated and begging the government to have a heart.** How can children focus on learning objectives when they’re preoccupied with the reality that their parent may be gone when they get home? How can children learn when they’re not coming to summer programs because their communities are scared into hiding? How does a child engage with academic material when their surroundings scream “Build the Wall”? IMMIGRATION POLICY THAT HURTS ALL STUDENTS Last year, the UCLA Civil Rights Project published a first-of-its-kind study on the impact of current immigration enforcement on schools**. According to the report, 70% of educators surveyed noted a decline in academic performance among their immigrant students, which they attributed to concerns about immigration issues**. **Educators also reported that non-immigrant students’ learning was being affected due to concerns for their peers whose families were at risk. This was especially true in southern cities, which educators reported were “hardest hit” by concerns about immigration policy and enforcement**. Student absenteeism due to fear of potential ICE raids was reported as a problem by 68% of administrators across all regions. Given that schools lose funding when students are absent, this problem does not only affect student learning, but also school finances and operations. Twenty-six percent of children under the age of 18 in U.S. schools have an immigrant parent. When we tell one in four children that they and their families don’t belong, and actively destroy their safety networks and well-being, we are damaging our society’s whole fabric. Can our country’s conscience rest easy knowing the dire circumstances we’re creating for children, including children we’ve formally accepted and children who’ve only ever known the United States as their home? TELL THEM THEY ARE NOT ALONE I return to my student’s question often. “What am I going to do?” Children have to know that they’re not expected to answer that question and that they’re not alone in their concern. In class the morning after the 2016 election, we discussed “the people that care about you and will help you or your family, no matter what.” Our discussion included examples of communities fighting deportations, and those efforts have only grown stronger. **Within our schools and classrooms, we also must change how we talk about immigrants, and respect the values and strengths they bring to our schools and communities.** To show that our education system actually cares about the educational outcomes and the future of all our students, educators have to let students know that we stand for them and with them, and that we will use the leverage afforded us by our positions, however small, to respond to this crisis. There can be no ambiguity about our support for them and our insistence that public debates respect their dignity. TAKE ACTION **Everyone has a role to play in ensuring humane immigration policy centers healthy communities, and the communities affected by the raids in Mississippi need support right now. You can help, regardless of where you are.** If you are looking for resources on how to support students in the classroom and establish a safe space for immigrants, please go to ImmSchools and check out the resources tab.

#### Psychological violence is the product of deportation in immigration – the worst impact in which literal torture is created. This comes first

**Lenders 18**, Mark Lenders, 2018, The Effects of Deportation on Families and Communities, Community Psychology: Social Justice Through Collaborative Research and Action, https://www.communitypsychology.com/effects-of-deportation-on-families-communities/ SJ||DH

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY **Deportation has numerous detrimental impacts on individuals who are deported, and on the families and communities they are forced to leave behind. This policy statement reviews the empirical literature to describe the effects of deportation on the individual, families, and the broader community, in order to inform policy and practice recommendations.** Deportations have markedly increased in the US in the past three decades, with 340,056 people being deported from the country in 2017 (US Department of Homeland Security, 2017). Most people who are deported have lived in the country for over a decade and many are parents or caregivers of US citizens (Brabeck, Lykes & Hershberg, 2012; Brabeck & Xu, 2010; Dreby, 2012; TRAC Immigration, 2006). Approximately 5.9 million US citizen children have at least one caregiver who does not have authorization to reside in the United States (Mathema, 2017). **Immigration policies have moved away from the goal of family reunification, and have the potential to harm US citizen children. For example, the hardship exemption of the Immigration and Nationality Act limits exemptions of deportation to parents, children, and spouses. Consequently, extended family caregivers, such as grandparents, are ineligible for the exemption in spite of any undue hardship caused to their US citizen family members from their deportation** (Zug, 2009). The effects of deportation are felt by individuals, families, and communities. Nearly 4 in 5 families screened in family detention centers have a “credible fear” of persecution should they be forced to return to the countries from which they migrated (US Citizenship and Immigration Services, 2016). **Many of those deported are forced to return to dangerous, turbulent environments, and deportations have resulted in kidnapping, torture, rape, and murder (Stillman, 2018). Deported individuals often find it challenging to support their families, and coupled with the trauma and stigma of the deportation, may find it difficult to maintain contact with family members; this often leads to severed relationships** (Dreby, 2012; Hagan, Castro, & Rodriguez, 2010; Zayas & Bradlee, 2014). Family members left behind suffer multiple psychosocial consequences. Separation of a child from a parent due to deportation is associated with economic hardship, housing instability, and food insecurity (Capps et al., 2015; Chaudhary et al., 2010; Dreby, 2012). Family members are often forced to take on new roles to make ends meet: the remaining caregiver(s) must often work longer hours, leaving little time for contact with children; older children often become primary caregivers of younger siblings and/or must work to support the family, impacting school performance and retention (Chaudhary et al., 2010; Dreby, 2012). **Following deportation of a family member, children demonstrate numerous emotional and behavioral challenges, such as eating and sleeping changes, anxiety, sadness, anger, and withdrawal. Even if the family is ultimately reunited, the consequences of their forced family separation often remain** (Brabeck et al, 2012; Dreby, 2012; Hagan et al. 2010). Moreover, the broader community suffers negative consequences of deportation regardless of first-hand experience. Following immigration raids and deportations, community members are often more fearful and mistrustful of public institutions, and less likely to participate in churches, schools, health clinics, cultural activities, and social services (Capps, Rosenblum, Chishti, & Rodríguez, 2011; Hagan et al., 2010; Hagan, Rodriguez, & Castro, 2011; Vargas, 2015). **Studies have also demonstrated that immigrant adults are emotionally taxed following deportations and the threat of deportations in their communities; associated anxiety and psychological stress has been linked to cardiovascular risk factors** (Brabeck et al, 2012; Martinez, Ruelas, & Granger, 2017; Torres et al., 2018). **Immigrant children living in communities where immigration raids have taken place feel abandoned, isolated, fearful, traumatized, and depressed (**Capps, Castañeda, Chaudry, & Santos, 2007). Moreover, children – regardless of immigration status – experience fear and shame regarding deportation, which impacts their sense of self and wellbeing (Dreby, 2012). In order to assuage the myriad devastating consequences of deportation on individuals, families, and communities, the US should make policy and practice changes. Federal immigration policies should keep families together through comprehensive immigration reform that ends the threat of deportation and bolsters hardship exemptions for all family members. Local communities should prioritize safety and inclusion for all families, regardless of immigration status, by developing programs to foster support networks, sense of belonging, mental health/healing, building community, and collective political action, as these types of programs foster hope and wellness for children and families. INTRODUCTION This brief first describes specific aspects of current US immigration policies. It then reviews the empirical literature to describe the effects of deportation on the individual, families, and the broader community. The literature focuses primarily on deportations of Mexican and Central American immigrants, which are the largest groups of immigrants to the US at this time. Findings from these studies form the foundation for policy and practice recommendations, which comprises the last section of this policy statement, but there is no reason to expect that these findings are not also applicable to other immigrant groups. POLICY BACKGROUND Changes in US policies around immigration and deportation affect individuals, families, and communities in which deportations occur. Over the past three decades, US policies and procedures have changed markedly twice. In 1996, the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (ADEPA) and the Illegal Immigrant Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) were passed into law. These laws expanded the types of offenses for deportation, enabled retroactive deportation, and weakened judicial review over deportations (Brabeck et al., 2011; Hagan et al., 2010). The second change came after the 2001 passage of the USA PATRIOT Act, which also increased administrative authority over deportations. With these changes came a massive increase in deportations. From 1900 to 1990, approximately 20,000 people were deported each year. In the mid-1990s, the deportation rate increased by 800 percent to 180,000 a year, but has since more than doubled to 340,056 deportations in 2017 (US Department of Homeland Security, 2017, Table 39). Of those deported, approximately 40% in 2016 had a prior criminal conviction (US Department of Homeland Security, 2017, Table 41), meaning that most enforcement policy is aimed at those who do not have criminal convictions (Brabeck et al., 2011; Dreby, 2012; Hagan et al., 2010, 2011; US Government Accounting Office, 2009). The majority of those deported have lived in the US for over a decade, with the median length of residence being 14 years (Brabeck & Xu, 2010; TRAC Immigration, 2006). Further, a growing number are parents whose children are US citizens (Braback et al., 2011; Dreby, 2012). These changes in immigration policy have moved the US away from the explicit goal of post-World War II immigration policy: family reunification (Hagan et al., 2010). Moreover, although the hardship exemption to the Immigration and Nationality Act authorizes the cancellation of deportation if such deportation would cause undue hardship to a US citizen, it limits deportation stays to the person’s spouse, parent, or child. Consequently, grandparents, who are often primary caregivers of US citizen children, are ineligible for this exemption (Zug, 2009). PSYCHOSOCIAL EFFECTS OF DEPORTATION ON THE INDIVIDUAL In addition to the trauma, violence or abuse experienced prior to migration or during detention, many immigrants who are deported return to extremely dangerous and often turbulent environments in their countries of origin. Some even face torture, abuse, rape, or murder. Researchers at the Global Migration Project developed a database recording people who had been deported and then faced death or other harms (Stillman, 2018). The researchers contacted more than two hundred local legal-aid organizations, domestic violence shelters, immigrants’ rights-groups nationwide, as well as migrant shelters, humanitarian operations, law offices, and mortuaries across Central America, and also interviewed several families (Stillman, 2018). Their database includes numerous cases where deportations resulted in harm, including kidnapping, torture, rape, and murder (Stillman, 2018). This is especially important to consider given 79% of families screened in family detention centers have a “credible fear” of persecution if they returned to the countries from which they migrated (US Citizenship and Immigration Services, 2016). PSYCHOSOCIAL EFFECTS OF DEPORTATION ON FAMILY MEMBERS Nearly 10% of US families with children have at least one member without citizenship, and 5.9 million US citizen children have at least one caregiver who does not have authorization to reside in the United States (Mathema, 2017; Romero, 2003). Therefore, deportation policies and procedures affect many U.S. citizens. Several studies provide evidence that the forcible separation of a family is associated with negative psychosocial effects for children and other family members (Capps et al., 2015; Chaudhary et al., 2010; Dreby, 2012; Hagan et al, 2011; National Council of La Raza, 2007). Indeed, we would expect the effects to be severe for these families since separation is not by choice and often occurs suddenly and unexpectedly, with little preparation or planning (Brabeck et al., 2012; Dreby, 2012). In this section, we discuss effects on children and the family unit. **The effects of sudden and forcible separation of a parent due to deportation on children are considerable. In a study of 190 children in 85 immigrant families across six US cities or towns spanning from the west coast to the south, Chaudhary and colleagues (2010) concluded that children faced serious challenges due to deportation of a parent, including economic hardship, housing instability, food insecurity, and separation from parents. Children experienced behavioral changes in eating and sleeping habits, and emotional changes such as increased crying, anxiety, anger, aggression, withdrawal, and a heightened sense of fear. These outcomes were still present six months later. In another study of 91 parents and 110 children in 80 households in Ohio and New Jersey, results were similar** (Dreby, 2012). A third study conducted in three cities after immigration raids also showed consistent results, with children feeling abandoned, isolated, fearful, traumatized, and depressed (Capps, Castañeda, Chaudry, & Santos, 2007). In fact, in a comprehensive review of the literature that ranged from 2009-2013, Capps and colleagues (2015) discerned that children experienced psychological trauma, material hardship, residential instability, academic withdrawal, and family dissolution after the deportation of a family member. Children who were present at the moment a parent was detained tended to have greater emotional, cognitive, and behavioral effects (Chaudhary et al., 2010). Furthermore, after a deportation, older children often needed to take on jobs to help support the family, which impacted school performance, persistence, and retention. The family unit is also greatly affected by deportation. The majority of those deported are men (TRAC Immigration, 2014). When this person is a father, frequently mothers become single parents, often with no or little income, and sometimes facing large legal bills (Dreby, 2012). Indeed, a study of immigration enforcement in six US locations between 2006 and 2009 found that families lost 40 to 90% of their income, or an average of 70%, within six months of a parent’s immigration related arrest, detention, or deportation (Capps et al., 2016). Given this context, mothers often work long hours, frequently at more than one job, which results in reduced contact with their children. Older children often become primary caregivers to younger siblings due to lack of affordable child care options. Moreover, parents fear losing custody of their children because of their new circumstances or threats made by immigration officials (Brabeck et al., 2012; Dreby, 2012). Furthermore, deported parents find it difficult to find work that would enable them to help support their families who are still in the US, which is demoralizing. This new circumstance, coupled with the trauma and stigma of the deportation, may make it difficult to maintain contact with children. A diminished emotional connection, combined with attachment-related issues brought on by a sudden separation, can effectively sever father-child and husband-wife relationships (Dreby, 2012; Hagan et al., 2010; Zayas & Bradlee, 2014). Because of these dynamics, it is often mothers who bear the largest burdens after a deportation. Even if the family is reunited, effects of the forced separation on all family members often remain (Brabeck et al, 2012; Dreby, 2012; Hagan et al. 2010). The effects of potential parental deportation on U.S. citizen children are arguably complex; however, in one study, children who accompanied their deported parents back to Mexico described profound adjustment difficulties, including a sense of loss regarding their future and the resources available to them (Gulbas & Zayas, 2017). These impacts extend beyond the nuclear family to grandparents and other relatives. Three of four Latinx[[3]](http://www.scra27.org/what-we-do/policy/policy-position-statements/effects-deportation-families/#_ftn3) grandparents co-parent with their grandchild’s parent(s) (Fuller-Thompson & Minkler, 2007). Moreover, more than 4.4 million children live in grandparent-headed households, thousands of whom are US citizen grandchildren of unauthorized grandparents. With the number of grandchildren being raised by grandparents on the rise and higher than it has ever been in this country, grandparent deportation is of great concern. Zug (2009) estimates that thousands of grandparents who are primary caregivers to US citizen grandchildren are at at risk for deportation. Grandparent-headed households already face more challenges than parent-headed households, including higher rates of poverty and stressful life events with fewer resources (Fuller-Thompson & Minkler, 2007). Although grandparent caregivers experience these challenges, their grandchildren do much better than those placed into foster care, and grandparent caregiving is associated with more positive grandchild psychological wellbeing and healthy development across the lifespan (Copen, 2006). When grandparents face deportation, their grandchildren may not only lack a primary caregiver (if their grandparent is co-parenting), but may lose their only caregiver and be placed in foster care, putting them at risk for multiple placements and poorer outcomes. The effects on children and other family members when another family member is deported are exacerbated by limited mental health services. Furthermore, when they are available, there are still barriers to accessing resources (Capps et al., 2015). These barriers range from a lack of therapists who are able to provide culturally-informed services, to a lack of insurance coverage, to unfamiliarity with therapy and mistrust of local services due to the deportation that has occurred (Brabeck & Xu, 2010; Hagan et al., 2011).

#### Thus, the demand: I take this round hostage and stand in solidarity with those who endure the violence of the borderlands.

#### The 1AC is a radical stance against debate as an English-centric activity, a site for revolutionary violence within a space that perpetuates the logic of the border through the exclusion of foreign flesh – i.e. IMPLODE DEBATE

#### So this is our fight

**Este es nuestro grito en el silencio, para que se une nuestra familia contra las fuerzas de la inmigración que enfrentamos en esta actividad.**

**Esta es la señal para aquellos que se parecen a mí, y hablan como yo, para volverse contra sus opresores.**

**Y finalmente, si tu no puedes pelear porque es muy difícil para ti, déjame asumir tu carga con la energía y el valor que tengo.**

#### A politics of xenophobia has infiltrated debate creating divisions and borders. Thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best performatively and methodologically breaks down borders in debate.

Giroux **5** (Giroux is an American and Canadian scholar and cultural critic and received his doctorate from Carnegie Melon. “Border Crossing: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education” Second Edition 2005 Taylor & Francis Group file:///C:/Users/abiga/Dropbox/things%20folder/Affs/Abby%20Border%20Crossing/Giroux%202005%20-%20Border%20Crossings.pdf) SJ\\DH

When I wrote Border Crossings in 1992, there was a theoretical rupture in the various disciplines and integrated fields of the humanities and liberal arts. What would later be labeled as “the cultural turn” generated a new-found interest and a host of complex theories attempting to reclaim the importance of culture, language, discourse, difference, agency, power, and politics. Border Crossings approached the heady theoretical innovations of postmodernism, poststructuralism, and a host of other discursive interventions with a certain amount of caution and respect. But more importantly, especially in light of these emerging theoretical discourses, Border Crossings attempted to draw upon these new and complex fields in order to rethink the nature of politics and pedagogy, especially as they interfaced and played out as ideological and cultural practices in a multitude of other educational sites beyond the traditional sphere of formal schooling. Needless to say, changing historical conditions posit new problems, define different projects, and often demand fresh discourses. In some cases, theories fashioned in one historical moment seem hopelessly out of date, if not irrelevant, in another. Any critical theory both defines and is defined by the problems posed by the contexts it attempts to address. While Border Crossings cannot escape the issue of changing historical conditions, many of the chapters in the original book have not only held up well over the last decade, but also appear more relevant today than when they were first written. Borders and border crossing as political and heuristic metaphors still occupy a central, if not more concretized, place in any viable social and educational theory. **In an era of unprecedented global flows both real and virtual, the ethics and politics of border crossing appear more pressing to the current historical juncture than when I first engaged the concept over a decade ago. For me, the concept of borders provides a continuing and crucial referent for understanding the co-mingling—sometimes clash—of multiple cultures, languages, literacies, histories, sexualities, and identities. Thinking in terms of borders allows one to critically engage the struggle over those territories, spaces, and contact zones where power operates to either expand or to shrink the distance and connectedness among individuals, groups, and places.** In the broader political sense, the concept of borders and border crossing serves to highlight that the goal of politics is transformative of both relations of power as well as public consciousness. **With the accelerated growth of global markets, borders, ironically, appear more constrained than ever before as the ever-widening gap between the rich and the poor leads to greater insecurity and instability. New forms of authoritarianism and militarism now attempt to contain oppressed groups, reduce citizenship to consumerism, and wage war on every conceivable sphere of public life. The porousness of borders in the afterglow of the toppled Berlin Wall became impervious fortresses in the new millennium, a militarized response to a world plunged into the Great War Against Terror. The proliferation of policed borders not only requires a new politics, but also a new political vocabulary and a strategy of resistance through which a public pedagogy can be forged capable of constructing what Chandra Mohanty calls forms of “transborder democratic citizenship.”1 The concept of a borderless world as used in this book, while seemingly utopian, speaks powerfully to both deconstructing the meaning of globalization** and redefining it around democratic values rather than through the ideology of market fundamentalism and its ever-growing alliance with the forces of militarism. I am convinced that the mutually related concepts of borders and border crossing are even more timely today in light of the growing need on the part of many educators, progressives, artists, and cultural workers to rethink the meaning of politics for the twenty-first century. **As war, fear, and virulent contempt for social needs have become the dominant motifs shaping the domestic and foreign policies of the United States, borders have become the primary category for signifying spaces of confinement, internment, punishment, surveillance, and control**. A militarization of public life has emerged under the combined power and influence of neoliberal zealots, religious fanatics, and far right-wing neo-conservatives who currently control the United States government. The primacy of a politics of constraining borders is seen also in the destruction of a liberal democratic political order and a growing culture of surveillance, inequality, and cynicism. As the United States increasingly imprisons more of its poor youth of color, rings the globe with military bases, transforms agencies for immigration into those of homeland security, and expands the imperatives of empire in a reckless invasion and occupation of Iraq, the signs of a highly militarized society become more visible than ever. In a post-September 11th world, American power is being restructured domestically around a growing culture of fear and a rapidly increasing militarization of public space and culture. As U.S. military action is spreading under the guise of an unlimited war against terrorism, public spaces on the domestic front are increasingly being organized around values supporting a highly militarized, patriarchal, and jingoistic culture that is undermining centuries of democratic gains. Borders increasingly appear more rigid, entrenched, and impassible as the United States moves inexorably toward a more closed and authoritarian society. We are living in dangerous times in which a new type of post-democratic society is emerging, one that builds on ancient historical tendencies but is unlike anything we have seen in the past—a society in which concentrated economic and political power reinforce each other through a media consolidated in the hands of a few multinational corporations. Unlike any other time in American history, we are living in a period in which a culture of fear and concentrated wealth reinforce each other so as to drastically limit the possibilities of a democratic society. Not only are civil liberties being rolled back, and public resources gutted because of a massive $422 billion deficit, but power no longer appears to reside largely within the sphere of politics, controlled largely by nation states. **Power is now set free from its political shackles and resides primarily with economic and military forces.** Political power is being replaced by economic power just as state sovereignty is being replaced by corporate sovereignty.2 Power has now become coercive, roaming the globe for new markets under the guise of American triumphalism and the quest for the rewards of empire. The United States is increasingly marked by a poverty of critical public discourse, making it more difficult for the American people to appropriate a critical language outside of the market that would allow them to link private problems to public concerns and issues. **Within this utterly privatized discourse, politics conceived as public activity is replaced with a politics that is banal, reduced to the politics of lifestyle choices, tabloid spectacle, or “patriotic” conformism. One result is a social order that seems dangerously incapable of questioning itself, even as it wages a merciless, top-down war against the poor, the young, [Wom[x]n], people of color, and the elderly. The obsession with the private (even as the right to privacy evaporates) not only burdens politics and undermines critical forms of individual and social agency, it also negates any viable notion of the public good and the social contract. As the social contract is shredded, government relies more heavily on its policing and military functions, giving free reign to the principle of security and border patrols at the expense of an open, free society. A culture of fear now overshadows a commitment to public service, endorsing property rights over human rights. A spreading culture of fear in an age of automated surveillance and repressive legislation is creating a security state that gives people the false choice between being safe or being free.** Even as surveillance cameras make their way into the nation’s public schools and FBI agents hang out in libraries and bookstores in order to examine what people are reading, there is barely a protest from academics or the general public over the shredding of constitutional freedoms and civil liberties. It gets worse. The CIA and the Pentagon are now allowed to engage in domestic intelligence work; the Patriot Act allows people to be detained indefinitely in secret without access to either lawyers or family; children are not only held without legal representation as enemy combatants in possibly inhumane conditions at the military’s infamous Camp Delta at Guantanamo Bay, but they are also subjected to abuse and torture by American soldiers at the infamous Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq.3 The war against terrorism increasingly appears to be a war against immigrants, dissent, and democracy itself as the racial state extends the ugly reach of discrimination under the guise of Homeland Security.4 Under such circumstances, the fundamental governing principles of democracy are not just being subverted but deliberately sabotaged. **This kind of democracy is the problem, not the solution. What all this suggests is that since Border Crossings was written, the American state has changed radically.** No longer viewed as a force for the public good and social justice, it now operates largely as a legitimating force for corporate power, willingly disposed to serve the needs of concentrated wealth, racial disparity, corporate globalization, and empire. Under the pressure of a relentless campaign of top-down class, racial, and ideological warfare, the state is being hollowed out and the public sector is being stripped not only of its positive social and democratic functions, but is increasingly reduced to its policing and repressive functions. In the shadow of the tragic and horrible events of September 11th, a brute authoritarianism becomes increasingly more ominous as society is organized relentlessly around a culture of fear, cynicism, and unbridled self-interest. Within this post-9/11 space, matters of politics and pedagogy coincide to produce a new kind of authoritarianism, one in which consent is manufactured and the militarization of everyday life proceeds largely unchallenged. While critical pedagogy was a fundamental concept for expanding the possibility of democracy in the first edition of Border Crossings, my focus has now shifted to the broader concept of public pedagogy which, I argue, is essential to defining the nature of politics itself. At the dawn of the new millennium, an authoritarian regime proceeds within the parameters of what I call a new kind of public pedagogy, one in which the production, dissemination, and circulation of ideas emerges from the educational force of the entire culture. Public pedagogy in this sense refers to a powerful ensemble of ideological and institutional forces whose aim is to produce competitive, self-interested individuals vying for their own material and ideological gain. Corporate public pedagogy now largely cancels out or devalues gender, class-specific, and racial injustices of the existing social order by absorbing the democratic impulses and practices of civil society within narrow economic relations. This form of dominant public pedagogy has become an all-encompassing cultural horizon for producing market identities, values, and practices. The good life, in this discourse, “is construed in terms of our identities as consumers—we are what we buy.”5 For example, the Pentagon even considered, if only for a short time, turning the war on terror and security concerns over to futures markets, subject to online trading. Thus, noncommodified public spheres are replaced by commercial spheres as the substance of critical democracy is emptied out and replaced by a democracy of goods available to those with purchasing power and to the increasing expansion of the cultural and political power of corporations throughout the world. **Dominant public pedagogy with its narrow and imposed schemes of classification and limited modes of identification uses the educational force of the culture to negate the basic conditions for critical agency.** As public space is increasingly commodified and the state is aligned more closely with capital, public pedagogy mobilizes power in the interest of a Darwinian world order marked by the increasing removal of autonomous spheres of cultural production such as journalism, publishing, and film; the destruction of collective structures capable of counteracting the widespread imposition of commercial values and effects of market forces; the creation of a global reserve army of the unemployed; and the subordination of nation-states to the real masters of the economy. As I point out in the third section of Border Crossings, the new sites of public pedagogy which have become the organizing force of market fundamentalism are not restricted to instrumental curricula, blackboards, and test taking. They do not simply incorporate the limited forms of address found in schools. Such sites operate within a wide variety of social institutions and formats including sports and entertainment media, cable television networks, the Internet, churches, and channels of elite and popular culture such as advertising. Profound transformations have taken place in the public sphere, producing new sites of pedagogy marked by a distinctive confluence of new digital and media technologies, growing concentrations of corporate power, and unparalleled meaning-producing capacities. Unlike traditional forms of pedagogy, knowledge and desire are inextricably connected to modes of pedagogical address mediated through unprecedented electronic technologies that include high-speed computers, new types of digitized film and CD-ROMs. The result is a public pedagogy that plays a decisive role in producing a diverse cultural sphere that gives new meaning to education as a political force. What is surprising about the cultural politics of market fundamentalism is that many social theorists have either ignored or largely underestimated the symbolic and pedagogical dimensions of the struggle that neoliberal corporate power has put into place for the last twenty years, particularly under the ruthless administration of George W. Bush. In the years since I have written Border Crossings, neoliberalism—with its unbridled support of the market as a template for all social and economic relations—has become the hegemonic ideology of our time. Much more than an economic theory, neoliberalism can also be defined as a cultural politics, one that created an array of institutions and public spheres from which to produce, disseminate, and secure its ideology, values, and views of the world. As I mentioned previously, power no longer resides within a politics shaped by the borders of the nation-state. Power escapes such traditional boundaries of politics and in so doing redefines both the meaning and the sites in which power is expressed and can be challenged. This new edition of Border Crossings attempts to critically understand and engage the increasing mutually determining forces of neoliberalism and militarization as they work through the modalities of race, class, gender, and youth. Questions of boundaries and borders dominate how the United States and much of the world now think about politics, power, history, and culture. **The concept of border crossing not only critiques those borders that confine experience and limit the politics of crossing diverse geographical, social, cultural, economic, and political borders, it also calls for new ways to forge a public pedagogy capable of connecting the local and the global**, the economic sphere and cultural politics, as well as public and higher education and the pressing social demands of the larger society. At stake here is the possibility of imagining and struggling for new forms of civic courage and citizenship that expand the boundaries of a global democracy. In the 1990s, the politics of difference dominated social and political theory. While differences are still crucial to any viable notion of social theory and democracy, there is an increased need for a politics and a notion of border crossing that can work across the fault lines of nations, classes, races, sexualities, and religions as they operate to create new forms of division, demarcation, and separation. Politics can no longer privilege the private over the public, texts over social contexts, or cultural identity over a politics that favors questions of social and public responsibility. Identity politics must be enlarged and ultimately subordinated to a broader notion of democratic politics, one that expands the connections between the public and the private while offering a common ground on which to build joint alliances and create the conditions necessary for a vibrant and substantive democracy. And it is precisely at this theoretical juncture that the concept of border has been expanded in this new edition of Border Crossings. The concept of border crossing now represents a project and commitment to both global democracy and the search for “a notion of commonality without which a refounding of democratic politics seems impossible, even unimaginable. . . . .”6 Recognizing that borders for many people are both enabling and exclusionary, Border Crossings attempts to engage the complex and dynamic force of the borderlands that people inhabit and cross through a range of pedagogical strategies and ideologies in which the naming, marking, and crossing of various cultural and geographical borders are addressed within the specificity of different contexts, strategies, and pedagogical practices. Against the crafting of monolithic contexts and fixed images of the other, Border Crossings raises the question of how politics and pedagogy might be practiced differently across a range of cultural, political, economic, and geographical boundaries. In doing so, the concept of border has been revised in this book to foreground the complexity of the relationship between power and politics, on the one hand, and agency and social change on the other. Similarly, Border Crossings puts a renewed emphasis on the need for academics to recognize that the most important relationship between intellectuals and the world is organized through the modalities of economic and cultural power. Intellectuals do not merely exist in universities, speak through the discourse of academic disciplines, and produce knowledge, they also exist in institutional spaces and ideological relations shot through with power and politics. And as the forces of market fundamentalism, militarization, and empire spread throughout the world, they are accompanied by the legitimating discourses produced by intellectuals. This suggests that such intellectuals become not only aware of the political forces that influence them and the institutions in which they labor, but also connect their work to the world in which they live while furthering the possibilities of shaping a society through the historical legacies and promises of liberty, equality, justice, and freedom. The borders of our diverse identities, subjectivities, experiences, and communities connect us to each other more than they separate us, especially as such borders are continually changing and mutating within the fast forward dynamics of globalization. How we theorize those connections as a force of tension, domination, and emancipatory possibilities is a difficult task, one that this book takes very seriously as part of a larger attempt to broaden not only the range of our commitments to others but also to develop more constructive, inclusive, and democratic communities. **Pedagogy plays a central role in this task because it is the sphere in which matters of responsibility, social action and political intervention are learned, developed, and put into play. Pedagogy in this sense becomes directive and performative** in that it is not merely about deconstructing texts but about situating politics itself within a broader set of relations that addresses what it might mean to create modes of individual and social agency that enable rather than shut down democratic values, practices, and forms of sociality. In short, this edition of Border Crossings points to the need for academics, artists, cultural workers, and others to address the crossing of borders not only as a resource for theoretical competency and critical understanding, but also as a pedagogical practice that promotes the possibility of interpretation as a challenge to the coming police state and as an intervention in the shaping of a more democratic global social order.

#### Your ballot should prioritize changing current dialogue by evaluating power relations within rhetoric. fiat is illusory and you should prefer marginalized and excluded forms of discourse because they are structurally denied access to, debate. (

**Butler 90** bracketed for gendered language\*\*\* (Judith Butler, "Gender Trouble", 1990, p. 20-21) SJ||DH

**The very notion of “dialogue” is culturally specific and historically bound, and while one speaker may feel secure that a conversation is happening, another may be sure it is not. The power relations that condition and limit dialogic possibilities need first to be interrogated. Otherwise, the model of dialogue risks relapsing into a liberal model that assumes that speaking agents occupy equal positions of power and speak with the same presuppositions about what constitutes “agreement” and “unity” and, indeed, that those are the goals to be sought. It would be wrong to assume in advance that there is a category of “[Wom[x]n]” that simply needs to be filled in with various components of race, class, age, ethnicity, and sexuality in order to become complete. The assumption of its essential incompleteness permits that category to serve as a permanently available site of contested meanings. The definitional incompleteness of the category might then serve as a normative ideal relieved of coercive force.**

#### Resist even if you think the aff is useless. Racial realism is the only approach to understanding what resistance necessitates in our world

**Cacho 12  \*\*\*Bracketed in original text\*\*\***[Lisa Marie (.Associate Professor of Latina/Latino Studies and Asian American Studies, with affiliations in Gender and [Wom[x]n's] Studies and English, at the University of Illinois, Urbana- Champaign) Social death: Racialized rightlessness and the criminalization of the unprotected. NYU Press, 2012.]

Dismembering social value by refusing “the lure of legibility” re-members the other because it gives us the space to be more critical of the automatic, understandable impulse to deny and be offended by criminalizing stereotypes. In this space, the space of social death, we can re-member the other by asking ourselves: Whom does this rejection really benefit and whom does it hurt? This project is not concerned with whether something is politically practical or logistically possible because these approaches need to assume that legal apparatuses are legitimate and fixable. If we suspend the need to be practical, we might be able see what is possible differently. A focus on social death enables us to start at the places we dare not go because it enables us to privilege the populations who are most frequently and most easily disavowed, those who are regularly regarded with contempt, those whose interests are bracketed at best because to address their needs in meaningful ways requires taking a step beyond what is palatable, practical, and possible. Like Barrett, Hong, and Holland, I find “empowering oppositional narratives” in the devastating spaces of social death and their populations’ abstract existences, but empowering narratives do not necessarily give us happy endings. Nor do they always leave us inspired.85 **In the spaces of social death,** empowerment is not contingent on taking power or securing small victories. **Empowerment comes from deciding that the outcome of struggle doesn’t matter as much as the decision to struggle.** Deciding to struggle against all odds armed only with fingers crossed on both hands is both an unusual political strategy and a well-informed worldview. It is a choice **premised upon** what Derrick Bell calls **“racial realism.” Racial realism is a form of unthinkable politics because it proposes that we**begin battles we’ve already lost, that we acknowledge and **accept that everything we do may not ever result in social change.**  When implementing Racial Realism we must simultaneously acknowledge that **our actions are** not **likely to lead to** transcendent change and, despite our best efforts, may be of **more help to the system** we despise than to the victims of that system we are trying to help. Nevertheless, our realization, and **the dedication based on that realization, can lead to policy positions**and campaigns **that are less likely to worsen conditions for those we are trying to help** and more likely to remind those in power that there are imaginative, unabashed risk-takers who refuse to be trammeled upon. Yet confrontation with our oppressors is not our sole reason for Racial Realism. Continued struggle can bring about unexpected benefits and gains that in themselves justify continued endeavor. **The fight itself has meaning and should give us hope for the fut vure**.86 Although racial realism takes failure for granted, it does not equate failure with defeat. **Accepting hopelessness is not** necessarily **equivalent to abandoning hope.** As Sara Ahmed writes in her critique of happiness, “To kill joy . . . is to open a life, to make room for life, to make room for possibility, for chance.”87 To take unthinkable politics seriously, we need to entertain counterintuitive thoughts and practice imagining otherwise. “To imagine otherwise,” Fiona Ngô argues, “failure need not be overcome, rehabilitation need not be desired, subjectivity need not be recovered.” Instead, she insists, “**we must conceive of an ethical stance that refuses to cover over the violence that brought us to the present.**”88 If the critical task is not to resolve the contradictions of reintegrating the socially dead into a capitalist society that sees most of humanity as a necessary but negative resource, then it makes sense to mobilize against preserving this way of life or the ways of knowing that this life preserves. Rather than “breathe life” into the spaces of social death (gentrification, privatization, and democratization), we might conscientiously work against the logic of survivability,89 which in the United States sees the preservation of U.S. capital as central and indispensable to the “American way of life.” In neoliberal ways of knowing, the value of life is subjected to an economic analysis and assessed accordingly: How has this person contributed to society? What will he or she accomplish in the future? Is it worthwhile to invest in this neighborhood and its residents or will such an investment be only a waste of resources? Lives are legibly valuable when they are assessed comparatively and relationally within economic, legal, and political contexts and discourses, framed by a culture of punishment according to the market logic of supply and demand. This means that, for the most part, value is not ascribed to living life in meaningful ways, and it also means that those who are socially devalued do not get to decide what makes a life meaningful or the terms by which their lives are evaluated as meaningful or meaningless, as valuable or valueless. By figuring out new contexts and ways of framing “why life is valuable,” we might figure out how to talk about social problems in ways that do not require us to appeal to market values or to redirect juridical and social repudiation toward other populations that constitute the “negative resource” to American value. Of course, we cannot discount that fighting for basic survival needs in immediate, practical, and strategic ways is urgent, important work, but at the same time, a meaningful life is not a luxury but rather the purpose of the struggle itself, the difference between surviving and living.

#### This is a debate about debate so yes give us the ballot

Reid-Brinkley 8 Shanara Rose. The Harsh Realities of" acting Black": How African-American Policy Debaters Negotiate Representation Through Racial Performance and Style. Diss. University of Georgia, 2008**.** (MA University of Alabama)//Elmer

Although the Louisville team provides a clear justification for their policy statement, i.e., their support for a full withdrawal of the U.S. from NATO, this advocacy is not really the central tenet of their argument. U.S. withdrawal from NATO is simply a metaphor for Louisville’s critique of the normative practices and procedures of the debate community. Louisville’s strategy is to engage the methods of debate practice. Thus, they argue that the resolution should serve as a metaphor, as one alternative to the strict interpretation of the resolution that leads to a hyper focus on policy considerations. The metaphorical interpretation changes the framework for the debate. The debate is taken out of the cost-benefit analysis framework where teams argue over the relative merits of a policy as if it were actually going to be enacted in legislation after the debate. The Louisville debaters argue that a metaphorical interpretation of the resolution allows debaters to shift their focus to issues which they have the agency to change. In the following excerpt, Jones explains the metaphor: **But you see, I’m really just trying to change the halls of Congress, that meets on the Capitol Hill of debate tournament tab rooms where pieces of legislation or ballots signed by judges enact the policies of our community. My words right here, right now can’t 113 change the State, but they can change the state of debate. The University of Louisville enacts a full withdrawal from the traditional norms and procedures of this debate activity. Because this institution, like every other institution in society, has also grown from the roots of racism**. Seemingly neutral practices and policies have exclusionary effects on different groups for different reasons. These practices have a long and perpetuating history.108 Signifyin’ on institutional symbols of American democracy, Jones’ draws attention to the parallels in power structures between the federal government and the decision-making arms of the debate community. **The “halls of Congress” represent the halls of debate tournaments. “Capitol Hill” where the laws of this country are enacted is a metaphor for debate tournament tabrooms where wins and losses are catalogued. Tournament ballots metaphorically represent the signing of the judges ballot at the conclusion of debates. In facts, debaters often argue that the “impacts” they identify or the solvency for their plan happens “once the judge signs the ballot,” as if assigning a winner or loser actually results in the passage of a policy. Jones argues that it is the ballot that is the most significant tool in influencing the practices and procedures of the community. In other words, the competitive nature of debate guarantees that teams and coaches remain responsive to trends amongst the judging pool. Ultimately, debate competition is a run to capture or win the judges ballot. That the ballot “enacts” the “policies” of the debate “community,” makes the space of competition a critical arena from which to attempt community change.** Up until this point, the policy debate community had dealt with issues of diversity and inclusion outside of tournament competition. Directors, coaches, assistants, and debaters may have engaged in outreach and recruitment practices designed to diversify the debate community, but discussions and support for such actions were not generated from debate tournament competition. Those discussions occurred in collaborative versus competitive settings where stakeholders were encouraged to dialogue without concern for winners or losers. For example, OSI (the original non-profit arm of the UDL) sponsored Ideafests to bring stakeholders in the debate community together to discuss the national expansion of the UDL. Thus, Green’s following argument during tournament competition directly violates the traditional practice of discussing issues of diversity and inclusion in the community, outside of competitive debate rounds: **Racism is one of the leading exports of the United States Federal Government and it exploits it on to other countries. It doesn’t acknowledge its problems at home and the debate community replicates those values by playing in this fantasy world that we cannot change. By sitting silent, by not acknowledging, or addressing the problems within this community. It is easy for us to say that there are problems racism and sexism but the problem comes when we recognize those systemic issues and do nothing to change our methods of how we challenge those problems**.109 Green is holding the debate community accountable for its failure in significantly increasing diversity and inclusion. **They hold teams accountable for their methodological choices in debate participation forcing other teams and judges to consider whether or not the traditional or normative ways of engaging in competition result in an activity and environment hostile to those debate bodies marked by difference.**

### .

#### State action is ideal theory under this aff since surveillance is the polar-opposite of border performance and only creates fear.

**McDowell and Wonders ‘10**

(Meghan G., M.S., is an instructor at Northern Arizona University, Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice and Nancy A., Ph.D., is a Professor at Northern Arizona University, Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice “Keeping Migrants in Their Place: Technologies of Control and Racialized Public Space in Arizona” 2010 Social Justice Vol. 36, No. 2//Michael)

The literature on surveillance and social sorting as technologies of control argues that nation-states are (re)drawing moral boundaries, (re)fortifying “assumptions about national identity,” and defending the body politic from the foreign Other, through practices of banishment and/or exclusion (Aas, 2007: 288). Aas suggests that the contemporary image of the disciplinary state is being transformed from a Panopticon to a “Banopticon” (p. 288). The “Banopticon” state continues to foster discipline in the classic Foucauldian sense by habituating migrants “to their status as excluded” (Engbersen, 2001: 242), but it also operates as a “factory of exclusion” for those marked as “undesirable,” as well as one capable of selective inclusion of those same undesirables**. The state uses technologies of control to engage in surveillance and “social sorting” (Lyon, 2003); a central strategic goal is to differentiate between legitimate and illegitimate mobilities in the global era (Amoore, 2006; Wonders, 2006). This state-sponsored commitment to surveillance and social sorting operates to discipline migrants and has fundamentally altered the character of the border and public space.**¶ The “idea” of the border has undergone a significant transformation due to globalization. No longer conceptualized as a fixed “line in the sand,” the border is increasingly being understood through the lens of performativity (Wonders, 2006) and mobility (Amoore, 2006). Under pressure to curb “illegal” immigration, states have moved toward internal, mobile border-control policies that rely heavily on various forms of surveillance and exclusion by law enforcement of- ficials and government workers. Weber (2006: 25) argues that “the state’s arsenal of exclusionary devices increasingly involves preemptive measures to prevent and deter unauthorized arrival; efforts to increase the efficient sorting of desirable and undesirable passengers at the border; and punitive responses.” Wonders (2006: 66) extends this point further by arguing that many “border performances occur in locations that may be far from the actual geographic border” and that day-to- day decisions by government agents, police officers, airport workers, employers, and others “play a critical role in determining where, how, and on whose body a border will be performed.” Some argue that **these mobile border performances, along with the potential for 24-hour surveillance and the development of fortress-style architectures within urban and public spaces, have a subliminal impact, reinforcing a “culture of fear.” As Davis (1992: 224) notes, “the social perception of threat becomes a function of the security mobilization itself [so that] fear proves itself.” The result of the “secure the city crusade” in part has been the destruction of legitimate democratic public space and access to public space for society’s “undesirables” (Mitchell, 2003). The ensuing proliferation of priv atized and “defensible” public spaces has “become a means of constituting a public through relative inclusions and exclusions and the regulation of bodies within the space”** (Peterson, 2006: 377).

#### Methodological pluralism is necessary to any sustainable critique, which justifies permutations - we impact turn your notion of “severance” or “exclusivity”. ()

**Bleiker 14** – (6/17, Roland, Professor of International Relations at the University of Queensland, “International Theory Between Reification and Self-Reflective Critique,” International Studies Review, Volume 16, Issue 2, pages 325–327)

Methodological pluralism lies at the heart of Levine's sustainable critique. He borrows from what Adorno calls a “constellation”: an attempt to juxtapose, rather than integrate, different perspectives. It is in this spirit that Levine advocates multiple methods to understand the same event or phenomena. He writes of the need to validate “multiple and mutually incompatible ways of seeing” (p. 63, see also pp. 101–102). In this model, a scholar oscillates back and forth between different methods and paradigms, trying to understand the event in question from multiple perspectives. No single method can ever adequately represent the event or should gain the upper hand. But each should, in a way, recognize and capture details or perspectives that the others cannot (p. 102). In practical terms, this means combining a range of methods even when—or, rather, precisely when—they are deemed incompatible. They can range from poststructual deconstruction to the tools pioneered and championed by positivist social sciences. The benefit of such a methodological polyphony is not just the opportunity to bring out nuances and new perspectives. Once the false hope of a smooth synthesis has been abandoned, the very incompatibility of the respective perspectives can then be used to identify the reifying tendencies in each of them. For Levine, this is how reification may be “checked at the source” and this is how a “critically reflexive moment might thus be rendered sustainable” (p. 103). It is in this sense that Levine's approach is not really post-foundational but, rather, an attempt to “balance foundationalisms against one another” (p. 14). There are strong parallels here with arguments advanced by assemblage thinking and complexity theory—links that could have been explored in more detail.

#### Grammar enforces a conception of what it means to be a “correct” English speaker. This form of “correctness” is racism and should not be embraced which is a reason to drop them. In other words –> T is racist.

**Niemi 15**, Rebar Niemi, “Mr. Nebel’s neighborhood, OR Nebel Tea– I sip it.” September 22, 2015. Premier Debate. (crossuply this for NEBEL T)

Though I believe Mr. Nebel to be fundamentally wrong on the debate theoretical level, I have a more serious objection. I will make this claim in the strongest terms I possibly can. **Correctness is racism.** Correctness is “you must be either a boy or a girl or you are wrong.” Correctness is “the ideal functioning body versus all others.” Correctness is one kind of person having access to The Truth and others lacking it. **Correctness is “sit down and shut up.” Correctness is “your kind aren’t welcome here.”** Any debater who runs so called “Nebel T” and any judge who votes for this argument must acknowledge that they are situationally and strategically embrace a perspective from which there is an implicit or explicit metric of what it means to be a competent english speaker. **What is the logical conclusion of speaking competent english? The notion that “mongrel” forms of english are inferior, diminished, unpersuasive, and should not have access to the ballot.** Quite possibly is the notion that those who can’t live up to these standards should not be involved in debate. After all, their dialects are not what resolutions are written in – it is people like Mr. Nebel whose dialect prescribes correct resolutional meaning. You may say that “competent speakers” was a rhetorical flourish, I am nitpicking, and that Mr. Nebel should certainly be allowed to take back his offensive speech. I will say this: the competent english speaker, aka the correct type of thinking and being, is the fundamental goal and top-level value that Mr. Nebel appeals to throughout his articles. If this is “not what he meant” then he did not mean that debaters should pay any attention to nor follow his logic. **Either he defends correctness or he concedes the irrelevance and negative impacts to fairness and education of his position. Nebel may appeal to pragmatics as a way out of the appeal to correctness, but in fact, his pragmatic claims are a pragmatic justification for correctness. This concedes pragmatics first anyway, and that so to speak, is a flow I can win on.** It is my opinion that there is no in or out of round benefit that correctness could provide sufficient to outweigh the toxicity of its implementation and rhetorical methodology.