Contention one – The Status Quo

In 2004 the United States issued 30 million dollars in reparations to Bracero workers --- yet there are tens of thousands who have not been paid for their labor.

Pitti ‘5 (Stephen, Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Gilder Lehrman Center International Conference at¶ Yale University “repairing the past: confronting the legacies of slavery, genocide & caste”, October 27-29, 2005, Yale University, http://www.yale.edu/glc/justice/thompson.pdf LEA

¶ Capiz and others have worried that Gutiérrez will accept only partial repayment of¶ bracero coffers, not the full $500 million to $1 billion they believe should be given elderly¶ contract workers. In defense of their own approach, members of Braceroproa argue that it is far¶ more important to begin some payment process, and that in so doing they will push forward a¶ more honest historical reckoning with past contract labor, and a more critical account of the¶ causes and consequences of contemporary Mexico-U.S. migration. Gutiérrez emphasized that¶ “For us, the most important thing is that they start paying. Once they start paying one exbracero,¶ they have to pay all of them.”19 That approach may finally pay some dividends, if not¶ sixty years of interest on lost bracero earnings. In December 2004, the Mexican government¶ included in its 2005 fiscal budget a $30 million fund to fund payments to braceros, covering¶ some 9,000 former contract workers who labored in the U.S. between 1942 and 1946. Tempers¶ have since flared as the Mexican government has seemed intentionally to delay the dispersal of¶ those funds. In mid-August of this year, when California’s Ventura Gutiérrez led a rally in¶ Mexico City to demand that the Mexican Interior Ministry begin disbursing checks, the¶ assembled crowd of former braceros and their families threw rocks at the Ministry, broke a glass¶ door, and crowded inside officials’ offices.20 Others have since continued to press the cause of¶ ex-bracero claims, and just within the last several weeks, the Mexican government announced¶ that its first payments, in amounts apparently ranging from $4,000 to $6,000, will begin in¶ November 2005.¶ Those who labored in the United States from 1942 to 1946 will be the first to receive¶ those checks, only those who enrolled with the Mexican government in 2003 will be included at¶ this stage, and BJM activists remain anxious about whether the tens of thousands of braceros not¶ included in this year’s budget will receive their due. Although the Mexican government now¶ seems ready to act, the process of negotiating repayment and respect for past bracero labors¶ remains deeply transnational. Networks of aging contract workers connect distant parts of¶ Mexico, cross into the barrios of Los Angeles and Chicago, and rely heavily on longstanding¶ 17¶ labor groups, and on the immigrant organizations that have gathered U.S. residents together¶ around social activities, and by home state, for decades. In Yucatán, therefore, the first payments¶ to ex-braceros next month will be coordinated by Gladys Pinto Muñoz, president of the Yucatec¶ Federation of California.21 In Los Angeles, the city’s vibrant federation of Mexicans from the¶ state of Zacatecas has played an important role in organizing the most recent ex-bracero¶ campaigns. Responding in part to bracero activism, the United States announced in April 2004¶ that Mexican workers eligible for U.S. Social Security benefits can now have those funds directdeposited¶ into Mexican bank accounts. And in the United States, groups of braceros continue to¶ work with hired attorneys to reopen a class action lawsuit that would force both countries to pay¶ all living braceros a far greater sum of money.

Contention two – Racist Biopolitics

First, the Braceros program is the nexus point between militarism, capitalism and structural racism at the root of exploitation and marginalization.

Garcia ’95 (Ruben is J.D. candidate 1996, University of California, Los Angeles School of Law;¶ A.B. 1992, Stanford University, commenting on Professor Kimber¶ Crenshaw's Fall 1994 seminar in Critical Race Theory at UCLA School of Law, ¶ writing a Faculty Scholarship at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas in the William S. Boyd School of Law, "Critical Race Theory and Proposition 187: The Racial Politics of Immigration Law", Works. Paper¶ 662, http://scholars.law.unlv.edu/facpub/662) LEA

C. The Bracero Programs and Operation Wetback¶ In the same way that American employers sought the labor¶ of the Chinese in the late 19th century, agricultural employers¶ made heavy use of Mexicans escaping economic and political¶ persecution after the political upheaval of the Mexican Revolution of 1910. However, when Congress passed the Immigration¶ Act of 1917, agricultural employers worried that the Act’s liter¶ acy and head tax requirements would severely reduce their immi¶ grant labor supply.5° Due to pressure from agribusiness, the¶ government waived these requirements for Mexicans.5’ These¶ official actions were crucial to maintaining an exploitable, non¶ white work force of hundreds of thousands of Mexicans.52¶ As jobs became scarce during the Great Depression, the¶ Mexican worker population was controlled through mass deportations of persons with Spanish sounding names or Mexican features¶ who could not produce formal papers.¶ Mexicans were deported from 1931-1934. Many of these persons were citizens or legal residents, but simply could not prove¶ their status. By 1942, labor shortages and World War II had¶ created the need for more agricultural workers.54 Thus, growers¶ convinced the United States government to enter into the¶ Bracero Program, a large scale contract labor program with Mex¶ ico.5 Braceros were the perfect exploitable underclass, willing¶ to work for low wages and in deplorable conditions.¶ By 1946, it became impossible to separate Mexican Americans from deportable Mexicans. Thus, in 1954, over one million¶ people were deported under “Operation Wetback.”56 Many¶ United States citizens were mistakenly “repatriated” to Mexico,¶ including individuals who looked Mexican but had never even¶ been to Mexico. The program included a relentless media cam¶ paign to characterize the Operation as a national security necessity, and a tightening of the border to deter undocumented¶ immigration.58¶ It found ways to keep more nonwhites from coming and dis-¶ empowering those already here. This system of marginalization¶ of nonwhite immigrants and their descendants continues today.¶ Since the passage of employer sanctions against those who hire¶ undocumented immigrants in 1986, it has become more difficult¶ and less socially acceptable to hire undocumented workers.¶ Since undocumented immigrants can no longer legally serve as¶ cheap labor, their presence in the United States has come under¶ attack from politicians, voters, and legislators.

Skeptics claim the Bracero program offered economic security and independence to workers – or that the plan trades off with Obama’s agenda– this type of political rationality epitomizes a racist biopolitics that makes war a constant feature of civil society

Eduardo Mendieta, Professor of Philosophy at SUNY-Stony Brook, April 25, 2002, online: http://www.stonybrook.edu/philosophy/faculty/emendieta/articles/foucault.pdf, accessed August 29, 2006

I have thus far discussed Foucault’s triangulation between the discourses of the production of truth, the power that these discourse enact and make available to social agents, and the constitution of a political rationality that is linked to the invention and creation of its horizon of activity and surveillance. I want now to focus on the main theme of this courses’ last lecture. This theme discloses in a unique way the power and perspicacity of Foucault’s method. The theme concerns the kind of power that biopower renders available, or rather, how biopolitics produces certain power effects by thinking of the living in a novel way. We will approach the theme by way of a contrast: whereas the power of the sovereign under Medieval and early Modern times was the power to make die and to let live, the power of the total state, which is the biopower state, is the power to make live and to let die. Foucault discerned here a telling asymmetry. If the sovereign exercised his power with the executioner’s axe, with the perpetual threat of death, then life was abandoned to its devices. Power was exhibited only on the scaffold, or the guillotine –its terror was the shimmer of the unsheathed sword. Power was ritualistic, ceremonial, theatrical, and to that extent partial, molecular, and calendrical. It was also a power that by its own juridical logic had to submit to the jostling of rights and claims. In the very performance of its might, the power of the sovereign revealed its limitation. It is a power that is localized and circumscribed to the theater of its cruelty, and the staging of its pomp. In contrast, however, the power of the biopower state is over life [expand]. And here Foucault asks “how can biopolitics then reclaim the power over death?” or rather, how can it make die in light of the fact that its claim to legitimacy is that it is guarding, nurturing, tending to life? In so far as biopolitics is the management of life, how does it make die, how does it kill? This is a similar question to the one that theologians asked about the Christian God. If God is a god of life, the giver of life, how can he put to death, how can he allow death to descend upon his gift of life –why is death a possibility if god is the giver of life? Foucault’s answer is that in order to re-claim death, to be able to inflict death on its subjects, its living beings, biopower must make use of racism; more precisely, racism intervenes here to grant access to death to the biopower state. We must recall that the political rationality of biopower is deployed over a population, which is understood as a continuum of life. It is this continuum of life that eugenics, social hygiene, civil engineering, civil medicine, military engineers, doctors and nurses, policeman, and so on, tended to by a careful management of roads, factories, living quarters, brothels, red-districts, planning and planting of gardens and recreation centers, and the gerrymandering of populations by means of roads, access to public transformations, placement of schools, and so on. Biopolitics is the result of the development and maintenance of the hothouse of the political body, of the body-politic. Society has become the vivarium of the political rationality, and biopolitics acts on the teeming biomass contained within the parameters of that structure built up by the institutions of health, education, and production. This is where racism intervenes, not from without, exogenously, but from within, constitutively. For the emergence of biopower as the form of a new form of political rationality, entails the inscription within the very logic of the modern state the logic of racism. For racism grants, and here I am quoting: “the conditions for the acceptability of putting to death in a society of normalization. Where there is a society of normalization, where there is a power that is, in all of its surface and in first instance, and first line, a bio-power, racism is indispensable as a condition to be able to put to death someone, in order to be able to put to death others. The homicidal [meurtrière] function of the state, to the degree that the state functions on the modality of bio-power, can only be assured by racism “(Foucault 1997, 227) To use the formulations from his 1982 lecture “The Political Technology of Individuals” –which incidentally, echo his 1979 Tanner Lectures –the power of the state after the 18th century, a power which is enacted through the police, and is enacted over the population, is a power over living beings, and as such it is a biopolitics. And, to quote more directly, “since the population is nothing more than what the state takes care of for its own sake, of course, the state is entitled to slaughter it, if necessary. So the reverse of biopolitics is thanatopolitics.” (Foucault 2000, 416). Racism, is the thanatopolitics of the biopolitics of the total state. They are two sides of one same political technology, one same political rationality: the management of life, the life of a population, the tending to the continuum of life of a people. And with the inscription of racism within the state of biopower, the long history of war that Foucault has been telling in these dazzling lectures has made a new turn: the war of peoples, a war against invaders, imperials colonizers, which turned into a war of races, to then turn into a war of classes, has now turned into the war of a race, a biological unit, against its polluters and threats. Racism is the means by which bourgeois political power, biopower, re-kindles the fires of war within civil society. Racism normalizes and medicalizes war. Racism makes war the permanent condition of society, while at the same time masking its weapons of death and torture. As I wrote somewhere else, racism banalizes genocide by making quotidian the lynching of suspect threats to the health of the social body. Racism makes the killing of the other, of others, an everyday occurrence by internalizing and normalizing the war of society against its enemies. To protect society entails we be ready to kill its threats, its foes, and if we understand society as a unity of life, as a continuum of the living, then these threat and foes are biological in nature.

And, you have a moral obligation to vote affirmative – traditional impact discussions ignore the way Bracero workers and their families have been disenfranchised by legal and economic rationality – only restitution solves.

Sullivan 12 – (Michael J. Ph.D. Politics, Princeton University “Which Prospective Immigrants are Political Communities Morally Obliged to Include?” Journal of Identity and Migration Studies Volume 6, number 2, 2012 http://e-migration.ro/jims/Vol6\_No2\_2012/JIMS\_Vol6\_No2\_2012.pdf#page=20) DF

The act of extending citizenship, or a pathway to citizenship through legal ¶ permanent residence to a new member at birth or through naturalization ordinarily ¶ represents a commitment on the part of a state to protect that person’s civil, ¶ political and social rights throughout his life. ¶ Nearly every nation accepts this responsibility towards the children of its ¶ existing citizens who are accorded citizenship status at birth through the principle ¶ of jus sanguinis. Most countries in the Western Hemisphere including the United ¶ States continue to accept additional responsibility towards children who are born ¶ within their territorial jurisdiction through the principle of jus soli. And nations ¶ assume the discretion to extend citizenship as a status and entitlement to its rights¶ and obligations subsequent to birth through their legal immigration and ¶ naturalization procedures. These legal principles for extending citizenship do not ¶ fully account for a state’s potential obligations towards persons who have been ¶ shaped by its economic, diplomatic, and military interventions abroad to the extent ¶ that it would be difficult, if not impossible for them to continue to live in their ¶ country of origin. A sympathetic case in this class of persons could include military ¶ support personnel in Iraq who have been targeted for collaborating with the United ¶ States. Nor do they account for a nation’s potential obligations towards non-citizen ¶ residents who are contributing to American communities as though they were ¶ citizens, such as unauthorized immigrant children who were raised and educated in ¶ the United States. ¶ These examples raise larger questions that speak to the concerns ¶ of normative democratic theorists about who should be included in a political ¶ community, or at the very least, allowed to take part in its collective decision¶ making processes. Apart from its existing legal mechanisms for extending the rights ¶ and obligations of citizenship to new members, should nations assume further ¶ responsibilities towards persons who have been affected by its policy interventions ¶ abroad? How far should this responsibility extend? Should a nation be required to ¶ include all non-citizens that it has impacted through its policy decisions as ¶ immigrants? Or should it prefer non-citizens who are already giving back to the ¶ community they wish to join? ¶ In its simplest formulation, the “all-affected interests” principle in ¶ democratic theory suggests that a political community has a moral responsibility to ¶ extend the participatory rights that we ordinarily associate with citizenship to non¶ citizens who are affected by a foreign state’s decision-making processes. The most ¶ effective way to ensure that a foreign national is included in a nation’s democratic ¶ decision-making process is to include him as a potential citizen. This feature of civic ¶ membership and its rights and obligations forms the basis for Robert Goodin (2007) ¶ and Rogers Smith’s (2010) proposals to extend a state’s obligations to all persons ¶ whose interests are harmed by its laws, policies and institutions. Both accounts ¶ could be useful as a way of describing why non-citizens might have an “adverse ¶ impact claim” against a state that has intervened in the affairs of their community, ¶ resulting in diminished economic opportunities or personal security for its citizens ¶ at home. An “adverse impact claim” stems from a moral argument that states ¶ which intervene in the affairs of other nations ought to provide compensation to¶ foreign nationals for any harm that can be directly attributed to their policy ¶ decisions over time. This compensation may take the form of economic assistance, ¶ preferential access to that country’s labor market through a new guest worker ¶ program, or reserved visa quotas for citizens of the affected community. The form ¶ of acceptable restitution for an adverse impact claim will depend on the wishes of ¶ the affected persons, who may prefer economic assistance in their communities of ¶ origin over authorization to reside in the United States. ¶ One problem with Goodin and Smith’s proposals is that they treat foreign ¶ nationals who have been shaped by another state’s laws, policies and institutions ¶ as unwitting victims. They do not fully account for a state’s moral claims to non¶ citizens that volunteer to serve on its behalf. Nor do they fully recognize the ¶ claims of non-citizen residents who are already contributing to the welfare of the ¶ communities where they live without the legal right to stay in the country. ¶ States have a greater moral responsibility to non-citizens who voluntarily ¶ contribute to their well-being at home and abroad than non-citizens who were ¶ passively affected by their policies. Some of them will want to remain in, or return ¶ to their country of origin. But if they want to immigrate to the country they served, ¶ or be permitted to stay in the communities they contributed to as residents, they ¶ should receive preference over other applicants for immigration benefits.

Thus the plan – The United States federal government should offer reparations to the Bracero Justice Movement, the Bracero proa alliance of Mexico, Alianza Braceroproa, National Assembly of Ex-Braceros/La Asamblea, Nacional de Ex-Braceros, and the Binational Union of Former Braceros

Contention three – Admitting responsibility

Voting affirmative shows solidarity with transnational activist movements which combat structural racism – our evidence is comparative, reparations are best.

Pitti ‘5 (Stephen, Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Gilder Lehrman Center International Conference at¶ Yale University “repairing the past: confronting the legacies of slavery, genocide & caste”, October 27-29, 2005, Yale University, http://www.yale.edu/glc/justice/thompson.pdf) LEA

More than forty years after the Program’s conclusion, both the United States and Mexico have been forced into heated discussions about the meaning of that labor agreement by former contract workers and their families on both sides of the border. The concerns of ex-braceros to some extent emerged from current calls in both countries to revive that international arrangement, but they also have drawn from longer-term analyses within Mexican American communities, and among scholars of Mexican migration, about the racialized nature of the migrant, agricultural labor system that continues to define much of the rural United States. Political activists have taken on the historical meaning of the Bracero Program with some form of reparations in mind --by which most seem to mean both monetary repayment of aging Mexican workers, but also a formal acknowledgement of bracero contributions to both countries, and perhaps a recognition that both nations remain guilty of creating a migration system that has long been ripe with violations of basic civic and human rights. The Bracero Justice Movement, as it has become known, claims deep roots in the efforts of the contracted Mexicans themselves during the l940s and l950s to earn higher wages and experience the protections and promises of their written contracts. It connects, to some extent. with both recent historiography emphasizing bracero agency” in the workplace. and with the oral traditions of braceros who have long told stories of their own ingenuity in the face of the U.S. and Mexican bureaucracies that negotiated and monitored the Program from above. The Movement also echoes a commonly-heard refrain among labor and civil rights organizers in the United States over in recent decades: The important contributions made to particular local economies and communities by groups marginalized by domestic racism. Finally, and in a way that might seem to contradict claims based on local” contributions, recent efforts by and for Braceros clearly reflect the maturation of transnational political linkages between Mexicans en el extranjero (outside their homeland) and the national political institutions, and the national media, of Mexico. The RiM grew on both sides of the international border, in fact, and its activities in the U.S. context drew heavily from organizations, individuals, and trends that extended their influence into Mexico itself.

The plan is a necessary first step to reconsider past atrocities and prevent future injustice. The Bracero proa alliance is calling for reparations– now is key, bracero workers are aging and entrenched in cycles of poverty.

Goodman & Rivera ’13 (Adam is a Ph.D. candidate in history at the University of Pennsylvania. Verónica is a Ph.D. candidate in history at the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM), “Bracero Guestworkers, Unpaid”, Jacobin, http://jacobinmag.com/2013/10/bracero-guestworkers-unpaid/) LEA

Every Tuesday, 76-year-old Miguel Díaz spends the better part of the day outside the House of Representatives in Mexico City. Díaz went to the United States in 1960s as a bracero, a contracted guestworker. Upon returning to Mexico, he and millions of other braceros were never paid the 10 percent of their earnings that had been withheld and sent to the Mexican government in an attempt to ensure braceros’ temporary status.¶ Each week, Díaz is joined outside the House of Representatives by around 100 other braceros, as well as widows and children of braceros. The vast majority are in their 70s or 80s. Some live in Mexico City, but others travel hours from other states to get there. Wearing sombreros to protect themselves from the sun, the braceros hang a large banner on the fence in front of the House that reads, “EPN [Mexican president Enrique Peña Nieto] Pay Us or Kill Us!” According to their organization, the Binational Bracero Proa Alliance, an average of 14 braceros die each day. Their cause is urgent.¶ The braceros’ struggle to recoup decades-old back pay sheds light on the unjust treatment and unexpected consequences of guestworker programs.¶ On September 29, 1942, 71 years ago last month, the first braceros were contracted in Mexico City to work in the fields of Stockton, California. The Bracero Program, the largest and best-known guestworker program in U.S. history, brought 4.5 million Mexican laborers to the U.S. between 1942 and 1964. The program emerged in part due to wartime labor organizing among American farmworkers and economic need in Mexico. “I went to work [in the U.S.] in order to eat,” said 84-year-old Ezequiel Osorio.¶ Like subsequent guestworker programs, the Bracero Program was designed by the U.S. and Mexico to create a steady, regulated flow of male laborers. Braceros labored mainly in agriculture, but some were hired to work on railroads.¶ While some braceros financially benefitted from working in the US, they did so at a cost. The U.S. and Mexican governments subjected them to physical scrutiny and humiliation. When crossing the border, immigration officials forced them to strip and fumigated their naked bodies from head to toe with DDT, a dangerous insecticide. Those who cleared the medical and immigration screenings worked long hours doing strenuous labor, often living in poor, cramped conditions on the employer’s property. Those who faced abuses could not quit without facing deportation.¶ Despite all of this, many braceros simply want the money they are due – the 10 percent of their earnings the Mexican government never paid them.¶ On May 15, 1998, in Puruándiro, a town in the central Mexican state of Michoacán, a small group of braceros and Ventura Gutiérrez, the son of a bracero, formed the Binational Bracero Proa Alliance. Gutiérrez was born in Puruándiro but moved to the U.S. with his family a year or two later. He grew up in Coachella, California, eventually earned a college degree, and worked in education and labor organizing before moving back to Mexico in the late 1980s. For the last 15 years Gutiérrez has dedicated nearly every waking hour to the bracero movement, traveling by bus or plane around Mexico and to the U.S. Several weeks ago, police in Michoacán detained him during a demonstration.¶ The Binational Bracero Proa Alliance’s mission is to organize braceros and their families in hopes of pressuring the Mexican government to pay the men the money they earned. In recent years, personal differences among leaders have resulted in the formation of a number of splinter groups, but the Binational Bracero Proa Alliance remains the largest, with 8,000 members in California, Arizona, Texas, Chicago, and in almost every Mexican state.¶ The group’s best-known action took place on February 7, 2004, when more than 2,000 braceros and their supporters descended upon the family ranch of then-president Vicente Fox in the State of Guanajuato. A smaller group managed to make it to Fox’s door, where they demanded to be paid. Their protest received attention in the Mexican media and, in part, led Fox to approve a lump sum payment of 38,000 pesos (just under $3,000) to each person who could prove that he had been contracted as a bracero decades ago.¶ Though this was a victory, coming up with the required documents has been difficult for most, and for many 38,000 pesos doesn’t go very far. “Thirty-eight thousand pesos is nothing,” said Adolfo Hernández, a man in his early 80s who lives in Mexico City. “Life is very hard.” Hernández, like most braceros, can no longer find employment because of his age. Others are physically unable to work, struggling to pay for basic necessities like utilities and food.¶ So Hernández continues going to the House of Representatives each Tuesday. Many who have already received the 38,000 pesos also continue to go, to fight for their full 10 percent payment, and to support their fellow braceros – the majority – who have yet to be paid any of the owed 10 percent.¶ The braceros who protest each week at San Lázaro played a key role in shaping U.S. and Mexican history. The fact that they are still fighting to be paid decades later is a reminder of how difficult it is for guestworkers to win even promised compensation for their labor.¶ Not much has changed in the last 71 years. As historian Cindy Hahamovitch recently pointed out, today’s guestworkers are “threatened with violence, housed in storage sheds, underpaid or not paid, and, most important, deported and blacklisted for doing something about it.”¶ Although it is unclear whether Congress will reach an agreement on current immigration reform, both the Senate and House plans would increase the number of guestworkers. Guestworker programs are “an objective reality,” in Gutiérrez’s opinion. “For more than a century there has existed a guestworker or bracero program in one form or another, and it’s going to continue existing until we recognize we’re mistaken.”¶ Based on the braceros’ experience, let’s hope that realization comes sooner rather than later.

And, voting affirmative fuses economic policy with racial justice and ethical decision-making.

Pitti ‘5 (Stephen, Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Gilder Lehrman Center International Conference at¶ Yale University “repairing the past: confronting the legacies of slavery, genocide & caste”, October 27-29, 2005, Yale University, http://www.yale.edu/glc/justice/thompson.pdf) LEA

¶ Such efforts have found considerable support among elected officials in California,¶ Illinois, and other states over the last few years, and despite little recognition of the Bracero¶ Justice Movement by some institutions within the United States (only two articles have appeared¶ in the New York Times about this movement, for instance, with the most recent a 500-word¶ account of Justice Breyer’s decision in 2002) there are countless good reasons for thinking more¶ carefully about this important feature of our recent past. In the first place, the cause of achieving¶ repayment for Mexican contract laborers has become, for many Latinos in the U.S., emblematic¶ of recent efforts to think transnationally about the meaning of racial and economic justice. In the¶ second, this movement history might remind us that it’s imperative to bring the Latino past¶ history into national and international conversations about the legacies of patterns (or programs)¶ defined by racial discrimination, particularly given the growing demographic and political¶ importance of Latinos in all fifty states. And, finally, the bracero case insists that matters related¶ to labor and work, and to legal status and claims to longtime residency, should complicate any¶ easy formula for thinking about how justice might be accorded in the future.

As academics and policy makers, we have an ethical obligation to consider the atrocities of the past – silence on matters of injustice breeds hate and intolerance.

Watkins ’07 (Mary is a core faculty member and the coordinator of community

and ecological fieldwork and research in the M.A./Ph.D. Depth Psychology Program at

Pacifica Graduate Institute. She is the author of a great deal of literature about the pyschological implications immigration have on society and immigrants. She is a co-founder of Santa Barbara for Immigrant Justice, “PSYCHES AND CITIES OF HOSPITALITY IN¶ AN ERA OF FORCED MIGRATION:¶ THE SHADOWS OF SLAVERY AND CONQUEST¶ ON THE “IMMIGRATION” DEBATE”, 204.50.56.189\_watkins\_publications\_psyches\_cities\_hospitality) LEA

These movements bring into dialogue aspects of American history¶ many would prefer not to know. For Whites, not knowing or not¶ remembering leads to a false sense of entitlement, an unquestioning¶ acceptance of economic privilege which distorts their image of¶ themselves, their labors, and rights. Keeping the past at bay allows¶ privilege to continue to accrue, balancing economic gain with soul loss.¶ In part, the past can be metabolized and the future created¶ differently by informal exchanges in the present between individuals¶ from groups that have been historically divided. In most towns and¶ cities, meetings between migrants and citizens happen only on top of¶ economic and ethnic divides. Immigrants without documents are not¶ free to speak of their difficult experiences on account of their fear of¶ racism and deportation. There is a collusion of silence that keeps Whites¶ ignorant of the challenges and heartaches borne by their fellow¶ townspeople.¶ To create sites of reconciliation requires insight into the need for¶ them and sustained effort to build bridges across separations established¶ over a long history. The learning of each others’ languages is a first step¶ toward more personal communication. Neighborhoods, workplaces,¶ adult education centers, and religious congregations can set up¶ intercambios, where pairs of people divide the time between speaking¶ in one mother tongue and then the other, all the while sharing the¶ bits and pieces of daily life. Beyond language acquisition is the creation¶ of relationships freed from the usual divisions. Knowing how unsafe¶ migrants feel in the larger community, citizens can offer their support¶ to community centers where migrants go for information about housing¶ and healthcare; they can help with immigration issues; and they can¶ assist in the learning of English.

Contention four

The way you evaluate this debate is to vote for the best ethical strategy for encountering the historical atrocities of U.S. – Mexican economic policies.

The act of reparation cannot take away the past, but is the best method of assuming individual responsibility to Bracero workers and their families. Vote affirmative to avoid objectification and commodification of the agrarian laborer.

Myers 99

(D.G., Texas A&M University, “Responsible for Every Single Pain: Holocaust Literature and the Ethics of Interpretation,” Comparative Literature, Fall//pg. PM/ wyo T.

Socrates' deontological advice that it is better to suffer injustice than to cause it (Gorgias 469c) is of small assistance to those who are rasped by the mauvaise conscience that they have already caused injustice. "Self-consciousness is not an inoffensive action in which the self takes note of its being," Levinas says; "it is inseparable from a consciousness ofjustice and injustice" ("Religion for Adults" 16). What he proposes is to replace deontology with a counterfactual ethics of responsibility. If I am not guilty of hurting another I cannot be blamed for it; but if I nevertheless feel accused of it I can take responsibility for it. In this way perhaps I can both ease my conscience and begin to repair any damage that I might have caused. My responsibility to the person I might have hurt-the human Other or Autrui, in Levinas's terminology preempts any claims of my own. Because the injury is counterfactual, because it is not specified and therefore not limited, my relation to the other is a relation of infinite responsibility, which means there is no escaping it ("Transcendence and Height" 20-21).8 In Buder's familiar terms, not to respond is to treat the other as an It rather than a Thou, an object to which things are done rather than a person with whom I might speak. But for Levinas there is no not responding. To ignore another is to shame her, to make her aware of her isolation from me, and thus to duck the responsibility for not hurting her in these ways. Everyone is responsible to another whether he knows it or not. Being human is living in responsibility. Levinas's ethics are not prescriptive, then, but descriptive. It is not that I should be responsible; I already am responsible by virtue of having consciousness. Every new encounter with another raises the question how I am going to respond to her. Either I can accept responsibility or I can default -there is no third alternative. The injustice to another "imposes itself upon me," Levinas says, "without my being able to be deaf to its call or to forget it, that is, without my being able to suspend my responsibility for its distress" ("Meaning and Sense" 54). These days we like to say that knowledge is ideological, by which we mean that it belongs to a historical world and is composed by the particular interests of that world. But a human being cannot be reduced to an object of knowledge; the effort to do so is "disturbed and jostled by another presence," which cannot be "integrated into the world"-namely, the presence of a human face ("Meaning and Sense" 53). This is perhaps Levinas's most famous insight. The human face is the site of human personality. "The face is not the mere assemblage of a nose, a forehead, eyes, etc.," he says; "it is all that, of course, but takes on the meaning of a face through the new dimension it opens up in the perception of a being" ("Ethics and Spirit" 8). The other is always already a Thou, because she has a face; she foredooms every effort to reduce her to an It, because objects do not have faces. When I look upon the other's face, I perceive the presence of something more than a composition of interests: I glimpse a being. Her face establishes her uniqueness, her irreducibility to explanatory context, her being-in-herself. Perhaps I can account for her behavior, but I can never account for her face. Her presence before me, revealed by her face, is a summons to respond, to bestir and thus to identify myself. "here I am" ("God and Philosophy" 182-84).9 The I-Thou relation is constitutive of the self, not the other. I construct myself as a person by how I respond to others. But I can also deconstruct myself. I can withhold myself in unresponsive silence, leaving open the possibility that I have treated the other unjustly, or I can seize her in an effort to know her, committing an act of violence that transforms counterfactual injustice into actual injustice ("Transcendence and Height" 15-17).

Ethics precede any “net-benefits” – relating to the other must always come before ourselves to recognize the complicity of our action in oppression – infinite responsibility to the other must be prioritized.

Murphy 2004
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Exactly what is motivating this flight from responsibility in politics? Rationalism or liberalism run amok perhaps? One might suggest that it is the obsession with reason in politics that has motivated the divisive treatment of emotion and affect, as they come to be construed as some type of contaminant that perverts political rationality. For those aiming to protect political rationality, shame and empathy alike represent the threat of affect and emotion. One could likewise attribute the degradation of collective responsibility to the prominence of political liberalism and its attendant focus on the individual as the locus of power and right. For the purposes of this paper, however, I would like to focus on the claim that it is the increasingly contractual nature of obligation and responsibility that has eroded our sense of social responsibility. 6. To presuppose that one’s responsibilities to another are to be derived from a social contract – however tacit one’s consent to this contract may be – is to presuppose that these obligations are finite and calculable, and that consequently they are responsibilities from which one might excuse oneself. Hence the litany of excuses that have become all too familiar regarding one’s responsibility for past injustices, excuses that have come to mark various discourses on reconciliation, reparation, and apology. ("I wasn’t even alive then, why should I be held accountable," etc.) Such excuses are indebted firstly to a convenient amnesia regarding the way in which past injustices reverberate in the present – and consequently continue to bestow benefits on some and injustice on others – and second to an inability to recognize that the very being of the oppressor/colonizer has grown and defined itself in reference to the subjugation of the oppressed. It is to presume that complicity is to be debated and chosen, and that it is not always already constitutive of the self. In order to deny one’s complicity in the oppression and suffering of others, one must somehow denigrate the ties that bind one to others historically and materially. To conceive of responsibility as strictly contractual is in many ways to do just that. As Nancy Fraser has suggested, the result of the increasing hegemony of contractual norms is that there appears to be less and less conceptual space for the forms of noncontractual reciprocity and solidarity that constitute the moral basis of citizenship (Fraser 1994: 61). As justice is rendered in reference to the calculus of contract and legality, the space for charity and political generosity is being eroded. This erosion seems to be accomplished as a double movement; firstly in the division of justice and charity, a breach that seems to imply that the two are antithetical, and secondly in the increasing erosion of charity by the calculus of justice. As charity is increasingly construed as the "other" of justice, it is – not unlike the experience of shame – construed as an phenomenon that surpasses and exceeds the obligations to others that are dictated within the parameters of the law, or the discourse on rights. Thus justice and charity are increasingly thought in opposition to each other, as though there is something in charity that is excessive and superfluous, something that the scales of justice do not and should not weigh. The dangerous implication of this way of thinking is that justice is not – nor should it strive to be – charitable. 8. And this is to say nothing of the way in which charity itself is being subsumed beneath the calculus of distributive (and retributive) justice. As the hegemony of the contract helped create the illusion of charity as its other, "charity appeared as a pure, unilateral gift, on which the recipient had no claim and for which the donor had no obligation" (Fraser 1994: 67). When defined only against contractual relations, charity does not simply become the other of more legalistic bonds of reciprocity, but even becomes politicised, as the giver is typically the beneficiary of social commendation while the recipient is only further stigmatised. Thus charity may readily morph into

We will win magnitude, time-frame and probability – now is the key moment to open discussions about racism in economic policy- Braceros are key to revealing discrimination
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Washington, D.C., and many other cities. A hot summer of race news -- Moral Mondays to preserve voting rights in North Carolina,¶ the efforts of the Dream 9 to expose the vagaries of our immigration policy, and those of the Dream Defenders to undo Florida's¶ Stand Your Ground law--have led many to speculate on whether we are at the start of a new civil rights movement.¶ We are definitely at the brink of something. I hope that it is a racial justice movement, one that builds on the legacy of civil rights¶ while bringing crucial new elements to our political and social lives. We have a chance to explore fundamental questions like the¶ nature of racism, what to do with the variety of racial hierarchies across the country, and how to craft a vision big enough to hold¶ together communities who are constantly pitted against one another.¶ Using the racial justice frame allows us to fight off the seductive, corrupt appeal of colorblindness, which currently makes it difficult¶ to talk about even racial diversity, much less the real prize of racial equity. Such language also allows us to move beyond the current¶ limitations in civil rights law to imagine a host of new policies and practices in public and private spaces, while we also upgrade¶ existing civil rights laws at all levels of government. Finally, the modern movement has to be fully multiracial, as multiracial as the¶ country itself. The number and variety of communities of color will continue to grow. If all of our communities stake out ground on¶ race, rather than on a set of proxies, we will more likely be able to stick together when any one of us is accused of race baiting.¶ The Need for Plain Speech¶ We cannot solve a problem that no one is willing to name, and the biggest obstacle facing Americans today is that, in the main, we¶ don't want to talk about race, much less about racism. Our societal silence makes room for inventive new forms of discrimination,¶ while it blocks our efforts to change rules that disadvantage people of color. Unless we say what we mean, we cannot redefine how¶ racism works or drive the debate toward equity.¶ Americans define racism as individual, overt and intentional. But modern forms of racial discrimination are often unintentional,¶ systemic and hidden. The tropes and images of the civil rights era reinforce the old definition. People taking on new forms¶ constantly look for our own Bull Connor to make the case. We can find these kinds of figures. But there's inevitably debate about¶ whether they truly hit the Bull Connor standard, as we can see in popular defenses of Sheriff Joe Arpaio and Gov. Rick Scott.¶ Politicians, employers and public administrators have all learned to use codes for the groups they target.¶ The notion that all racism is intentional and overt is a fundamental building block of the false solution of colorblindness.¶ The obsession with examining the intentions of individual actors in order to legitimize the existence of racism undermines efforts to¶ achieve justice. This is because the discussion of racism in the U.S. is devoid of any mention of history, power or policy. The¶ person who notices racial disparities in health care, for example, is vilified for so-called race baiting, while someone like Rep.¶ Steve King is virtually unchallenged when he puts up a sign referring to the State Children's Health Insurance Program as¶ "Socialized, Clintonesque, Hillary Care for Illegals and Their Children." Hey, he didn't say Latino illegals, so that's not racist.¶ Fifteen years of brain research have revealed that ignoring racial difference is impossible, and that most human beings are¶ unconscious of their biases. Thus getting people to acknowledge and change their biases voluntarily is often very difficult, and if it¶ does happen, is insufficient to address the institutional problem.¶ Even people who don't dismiss the need for race talk entirely often have the wrong end goal in mind. They encourage respect for¶ diversity, or multiculturalism. Those are both good things. But neither one is the same thing as justice. It is entirely possible to have¶ a diverse community, city or workplace that is marked by inequity. In restaurants I've worked in and observed, the white workers in¶ the dining room get along perfectly well with black and Latino workers confined to the kitchen and dishroom, but they are not in an¶ equitable situation. In being explicit about working on racial justice, our modern movement has a chance to push past the diversity¶ goal and define justice.¶ Justice and Rights Aren't the Same¶ Justice can include civil rights laws, but civil rights laws don't always include justice. The difference between the two is suggested¶ for me in that old school precursor to jokes, "There oughta be a law." There ought to be lots of laws and we won't get them unless¶ we recognize the limits of the laws we have now in relation to justice.¶ Here is NOLO Press's plain language definition of civil rights.¶ Rights guaranteed by the Bill of Rights, the 13th and 14th, 15th and 19th Amendments to the Constitution. Civil rights include¶ civil liberties (such as the freedom of speech, press, assembly, and religion), as well as due process, the right to vote, equal and¶ fair treatment by law enforcement and the courts, and the opportunity to enjoy the benefits of a democratic society, such as¶ equal access to public schools, recreation, transportation, public facilities, and housing.¶ "Civil" refers largely to political rights, but communities of color need change in economics and culture, too, the kind of change that¶ hasn't yet been encoded in the law. People of color should be able to see ourselves on television and in movies as something other¶ than villains far more often than we do now, but there is no law that calls this a "right." Food justice would mean that people could¶ get access to fresh produce at reasonable prices within a short distance from their homes, yet no law punishes grocery store¶ chains for abandoning poor neighborhoods of color. But laws and other structures could be crafted to change these arrangements¶ that too many people currently accept as "just the way it is." In fact, over time, the kinds of rules and regulations that once supported¶ cultural rights, such as the fairness doctrine in communications law, have been steadily gutted by the same deregulation that¶ created Fox News.¶ People should not be subjected to exploitation on the job, but labor laws, including those against discrimination that are in Title VII¶ of the Civil Rights Act, don't get us anywhere near workplace justice. After New York Times labor reporter Steven Greenhouse¶ examined the comment threads from his reporting on the growing fast food workers strikes, he was moved to tweet that he'd never¶ seen such lack of sympathy for workers. Research by Topos reveals that most Americans do not think of crappy jobs as exploitative¶ jobs. They think "entry level" jobs are meant to pay little, and they put all the responsibility for improvement on the workers¶ themselves, in the form of further education to get a better job. That sentiment was borne out again and again in Greenhouse's¶ comment thread. The fact that people of color, especially black people, are heavily concentrated in the fast food industry strikes me¶ as the trigger for that kind of easy victim blaming.¶ The language of justice simply gives us more options for articulating what fairness looks like than does the language of civil rights.¶ Only a big, broad vision will be exciting enough to mobilize Americans for the hard thinking and action required to meet our¶ upcoming challenges. The country's changing demographics are at the top of the challenge list for me.¶ Going Multiracial¶ When the March on Washington took place in 1963, there was also organizing among Latino, indigenous and Asian communities.¶ These communities were often inspired by and related to the movement against Jim Crow segregation in the South, and they had¶ their own forms of exploitation and discrimination to confront. The exploitative Bracero Program, which recruited Mexican guest¶ workers for farmwork, had to be ended, and so did its brutal aftermath, Operation Wetback, which deported those same workers¶ when they dared to overstay. The effects of Japanese American internment had to be addressed, and American Indians were trying¶ to protect families from having their kids stolen right through the 1970s.¶ Connections surely existed between these groups during the 1960's, and they cannot be minimized. I know, however, that those ties¶ were not nearly as strong as they need to be today.

Voting affirmative advocates a network politics where individuals, policy makers, social justice movements can redress the historical atrocities done to Bracero workers and their families. Our method overcomes the pitfalls of radicalism and liberalism and reconceptualizes politics to focus on disenfranchised peoples and is a necessary first step to breaking down structures of oppression.
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As we have detailed in the previous chapters, Mexican immigrants have a long-standing relationship with US society, and the demographic shifts that make Latinos the largest minority ground residing in the US drive that point home. After detailing the abuses suffered by workers and finding repeated evidence of the mistreatment of Mexican as disposable laborers, it is clear that we must ask: what is to be done? Instead of justifying complacency by detailing the deleterious effects of economic and racial marginalization, we conclude with a range of possible action strategies. We believe social justice movements offer substantial hope for bettering social relations by ending the historical pattern of exploiting Mexican workers to satisfy the consumption desires of North Americans. We fully acknowledge that the issues Mexicans face in the US are big issues necessitating big answers. Engaging in transformative politics requires building a movement to end the capitalist and racist system on a global scale. As a starting point, we talk about possible solutions or reforms that range from the pragmatic state of Mexican-US relations to anti-systemic global movements. We are concerned that envisioning new worlds through popular education, transformative social practices through grassroots participatory democracy, and transnational social movements is too often precluded by a discursive closure on the topic of Mexican Immigration that reduces all big issues to sets of binary options. Politics itself is too frequently defined by the non-representative political system of political talk shows, although it is clear politics is all-pervasive. We address the binary options that have been presented to this point and weigh in on the positions that may or may not move us closer to the end of capitalist inequalities and institutional racism. As we are considering directions for action, we recognize that in all major conversations on these topics, there are three main approaches to progressive social change: liberal adjustments, social democratic reforms, and transformative politics. Liberal adjustments make minor alterations that rarely address the fundamental causes of immigration dilemmas. They leave the transnational capitalist system intact, this ensuring that Mexican immigrants will continue to be exploited as cheap labor. Social democratic reforms are, in a sense, non-reformist reforms (Gorz 1973) that seek fundamental transformations of the capitalist system through an engagement with policies and legal actions that play on the contradictions of the system to change the social order. The problem with the social democratic reforms is that they all too often suggest that reforms have to be taken for the poor or racialized; they assume those deemed poor or racialized are not able to take action themselves. Transformative approaches get at the roots of the oppressive exploitative system. Rather than being passive agents, transformative subjects are active in reordering social relationships, diagnosing social inequalities, and mobilizing for a better way of socially organizing the world. The discursive closure on US immigration law has precluded any serious discussion of real comprehensive immigration reform, and of which actors should determine a fair, sane system. Even the most progressive of labor unions fall into choosing between either-or options to get a bill passed that eases some of the marginalization associated with undocumented immigration. We discuss potential solutions to the farmworker morass, as well as how to re-envision the notion of comprehensive immigration reform from social democratic and transformative perspectives. While the full demilitarization of the US-Mexico border and decriminalization of illegal immigration may seem like major steps, it must be noted that the militarized border as such has been in place for only 25 years. The border is not nearly as naturalized as is often assumed. Distinguishing between illegal and legal immigrants is also a recent phenomenon that is a direct result of the 1986 IRCA. Thinking beyond the “choices” offered to us by the mainstream media, such as more or less border enforcement and temporary worker programs or enacting harsher criminal penalties, is an essential precursor to pursuing transformative politics. Today, many progressive organizers and educators advocate for coalition politics, based on organizations that come together to collaborate when issues of shared interest and concern arise. The concept of coalitions suggests that organizations are solid and constant in terms of their ideas and practiced; the coalition does not require any changes in intergroup or interpersonal politics. We prefer to envision a concept of network politics because it emphasizes the dynamics of how organizations come together in processes of mutual learning and solidarity. It suggests that new relationships are built through interactions that make central the experiences of historically marginalized or exploited people. Swords (2005, 2007) writes about network politics as the material and cultural practices of neo-Zapatista organizations that challenge procedural democracy and neoliberal development. The Zapatistas and many of their supporters disrupt the territorial and ideological power of state and economic interests by decentering knowledge production and decision-making. To do so, they center indigenous and poor people’s experiences through peace and human rights organizing, caravans, delegations, Euceuntros (international political gatherings), Consultas (popular consultations), elections, community mental health work, struggles for territory, and initial efforts toward autonomy. Learning from the Zapatistas’ network politics suggests that in the US transformative movements must center the experiences of Mexicans, Mexican immigrants, and Mexican Americans, along with experiences of other historically marginalized and exploited groups. One important element of network politics is the telling of stories of exploitation, discrimination, and neglect. Those who build this country must be seen where they have often been invisible. The people often involved in network politics must also come to recognize patterns, the similarities and differences in how exploitation has operated from the Bracero to the post-industrial era. Such patterns include the trends we have documented in Chapters 5 to 11, including anti-immigrant backlash, demographic shifts, and the variety of modes of exploitation, incorporation, and exclusion in different geographic sites. Organizing must include demands for basic survival, as well as rights for workers and immigrants and participation in decision-making about the basic laws that affect health, well-being, integrity, and humanity. We see the development of legal challenges to the racial and class status quo for Mexican laborers as a window into how liberal adjustments and social democratic reforms can potentially lead to a politics of transformation. Recent class-action lawsuits, state congressional inquiries, and proposed federal legislation have brought the sordid history of the Repatriation Movement and the Bracero Program into the present discourse. What began as essentially a liberal adjustment approach to repatriations was based in legal offices and subscribed to the price tag model of just compensation for past wrongs. The lawsuits evolved into a social democratic redress approach in terms of holding corporate and government actors responsible for past events and working to bar them from happening in the future. Of course, laws that secured civil liberties and adherence to the Geneva Convention have been rewritten to allow such abuses as Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo, so activists must avoid the pitfall of assuming that rogue leaders won’t rewrite laws and bring on ideologues to rewrite history to justify their plans for committing future atrocities. We envision the movement developing a transformative politics approach with truth commissions leading to civil society mobilization, approach with truth commissions as ends in and of themselves. The transformative seeds of the Bracero reparations movement in grassroots organizing may germinate into major social change. Transformative politics does not agree with the liberal reparations model, which claims that monetary compensation fully atones for past transgression. In contrast, highlighting the grassroots movement, such politics sees the potential for a liberal adjustment to contain the seeds of social democratic reform that, if reorganized and plugged into network politics, could read to a transformative approach. Solutions to the exploitation of undocumented labor will bring the role of the immigrant rights movement and network politics to the center of recent efforts at improving the conditions of Mexicans residing in the US as well as addressing attempts at collective redress for past historical injustices. Reparations can never fully remedy past wrongs and the limited monetary settlements will never make up for pain, suffering, humiliations, and outright physical and psychological torture. However, the positive aspect of this liberal adjustment is that it required the collective conscience of a nation to come to grips with its sordid history and to allow those who were wronged to express publicly what they endured as a nation-state either looked away or more likely was complicit. The public dialogue on reparations moves offending nations forward by requiring them to deal with a past they deem so easy to forget. The grassroots organizing that has taken place in Mexico and the US required both nations to seriously examine the historical origins of contemporary racialized predicaments and lingering inequalities. Alianza Braceroproa, National Assembly of Ex-Braceros/La Asamblea Nacional de Ex-Braceros, and the Binational Union of Former Braceros are the more prominently recognized of the social movement organizations placing pressure on the Mexican government for monetary redress. The main means of organizing is to get ex-Braceros together, on a weekly basis, to talk about their shared experiences. Most of these public conversations have focused on the humiliating aspects of the processing centers where Braceros were subjected to the STD and hernia examinations and the DDT delousing ordeal. Recent developments in US courts and Mexican federal decisions have allowed the Mexican government to provide a limited monetary settlement while absolving its culpability for past wrongs. Yet the main contribution of collective action at this point seems to be the shared recognition of past wrongs and ways of remembering, thinking, speaking, and acting that completely counter the subservient roles that the Bracero Program attempted to force on workers.