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#### Scene 1: In the fields, la migra. Mi tia saying, “No corran, don’t run. They’ll think you’re del otro lado.” In the confusion, Pedro ran, terrified of being caught. He couldn’t speak English, couldn’t tell them he was fifth generation American. Sin papeles – he did not carry his birth certificate to work in the fields. La migra took him away while we watched. Se lo llevaron… They deported him to Guadalajara by plane.

García 19 (Armando, Assistant Professor of English at UC Riverside, “Disposable Subjects: Staging Illegality and Racial Terror in the Borderlands.” Critical Philosophy of Race, Volume 7, Issue 1, 2019, pp. 160-186 (Article). Published by Penn State University Press //shree)

This article draws on Gloria Anzaldúa’s philosophy to analyze Latina/o cultural forms as responses to the lawful violence that renders migrants and other minoritarian peoples as disposable subjects. The article turns to Latina/o playwrights and undocumented poets whose art forms, produced under the deportation regime, express a desire for freedom from terrorizing governance. Focusing on Lydia (2008), a play by Mexican American playwright Octavio Solis, and poetry by an undocumented artist, Yosimar Reyes, it links these representations of “illegal” migrants to understand how minoritarian aesthetic practices respond to racial terror and lawful violence. It argues that if we are to map the present beyond terrorizing forms of law, we must center our philosophical thought on “illegal” imaginaries of freedom, not on the cultural forms sanctioned by legality—the latter risk reproducing the logic of state-sponsored violence, whereas the former enact freedom as a practice of everyday life. Deporting Salvadorans is another clear sign of Trump’s racist agenda. For trans and queer Salvadorans, deportation is not an option, it is a deportation to our death. —adonias arévalo The U.S.-Mexican border es una herida abierta where the Third World grates against the first and bleeds. . . . The only “legitimate” inhabitants are those in power, the whites and those who align themselves with whites. Tension grips the inhabitants of the borderlands like a virus. Ambivalence and unrest reside there and death is no stranger. —gloria anzaldúa The political arena in the United States bears witness to the demise of democracy’s promise to uphold a social contract between the state and those it is designed to serve. As a response to this terrorizing present, Adonias Arévalo’s words directly address a state that continues to target some of the most vulnerable communities to deprive them all of rights under democracy.1 Arévalo is an UndocuQueer organizer who arrived in the United States at the age of twelve as an undocumented migrant. As of last year, he was living under the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program that registers undocumented migrants brought to the United States as children. DACA suspends the deportation proceedings of those who qualify for enrollment. The program was rescinded by the Trump administration in September 2017, and at the time of its closing, it enrolled close to 800,000 people. All DACA recipients will become eligible for deportation should the program be terminated this year, as President Trump promised to do when he closed the program. On January 8, 2018, officials from the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) announced that they were closing the Temporary Protected Status (TPS) program for nearly 200,000 people from El Salvador, all of whom arrived in the United States following the 2001 earthquakes.2 Under TPS, Salvadoran migrants received permission to live and work legally without repercussions, and with the closing of the program, they must now leave or face deportation. A few days after ending TPS, immigration officials also announced the continuation of the DACA program, but its legal parameters are currently being contested in the courts. Until they determine the program’s constitutionality, the lives of people like Arévalo will be at the mercy of a democratic state. For Arévalo, the deportation of Salvadorans and DACA recipients represents a “racist agenda” that would send them to their death. Their precarious condition under the United States legal system echoes Gloria Anzaldúa’s Borderlands/La Frontera, where the philosopher analyzes subjectivity in the borderlands as a form of life that is marked by racial terror.3 The inhabitants of the borderlands live with death beside them. Anzaldúa’s claim came true soon after the Trump administration moved into the White House, when the headlines drew attention to how agents from Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) arrested 41,318 immigrants in the first hundred days of the new administration.4 More than four hundred immigrants were detained and sent to detention centers every day. The numbers represent an increase of 37.6 percent compared to last year’s arrests during the same period. This sharp increase in arrests has also been met with the administration’s increased investment in private detention centers and its plans to expand the hiring of ICE agents.5 ICE intends to intensify the pace with which detention centers are filled with undocumented migrants without any legal rights, and in the process, the people who will occupy such spaces will be reduced to bodies for whom death is no stranger. More than simply mirroring Anzaldúa’s philosophy, however, the actions against migrants signal a plan of elimination by a necro-state.6 In her study of racial violence and immigration under the Obama administration, Alicia Schmidt Camacho proposes that although federal legislators have not called for total expulsion of undocumented people, the discourse and practices of immigration policies—apprehension, detention, removal, deportation—are “tantamount to social cleansing.”7 Obama’s administration refused to put forth a call for immediate expulsion of immigrants in order to avoid staining itself with the marks of xenophobia and totalitarianism. The discourse of forced removal, however, “moves mass deportation from the status of the unthinkable to the imaginable [and] justifiable realm of state violence.”8 In lieu of mass deportations, Obama mobilized an imaginary of exceptional violence during his presidency by instituting a carceral system that apprehended and detained over 5 million undocumented migrants.9 More than 2 million were deported between 2008 and 2016, according to DHS official records.10 In turn, the Trump administration’s executive orders have fully consolidated a deportation regime. Under the guise of democracy and its righteous refusal to impose mass deportations, what we are now experiencing is a “regime of expulsion,” a form of governance that consolidates its legitimacy by normalizing terror.11 Today’s acts of violence against migrants and other deportable subjects— Latina/o communities in particular—demand we mine the deportation regime in light of Anzaldúa’s philosophy. Anzaldúa’s work is especially important now in the context of state-sponsored forms of violence. Borderlands/La Frontera meditates on the legal underpinnings of terror by thinking of normative power through the subjects who are hailed by it. Its focus on humanizing the experiences of “illegality” calls our attention to how particular bodies are rendered disposable because they do not embody normative citizenship. As a humanistic turn toward illegality, Anzaldúa’s philosophy offers me an entry point for conceiving of practices that respond to and also alter our aberrant present. I draw on her theory of power and borderlands subjectivity (los atravesados) to consider how subjects who live under threat of deportation experience illegality as a form of everyday life under a legal system that means to dispose of them. The reported statistics register our present vis-à-vis numerical and legal evidence, and this mode of knowledge production most often relegates the experiences of migrants to anecdotal evidence in the reports. Rather than focusing on the ever-changing immigration politics, in this article I turn to artists from the Latina/o communities who are targeted for massive elimination.12 I look to cultural forms produced under the regime of expulsion to understand how Latina/o artists respond to the violence that converts migrants and other minoritarian peoples into disposable subjects. My analysis privileges the aesthetic practices of minoritarian artists in order to register the present as it is lived by those whose brown skin marks them as disposable. I focus on Latina/o theatre and poetics as representations of undocumented migrants that directly, although not always explicitly, respond to the state. My first case study, Octavio Solis’s Lydia (2008), is a play telling the story of a Mexican American family and their undocumented Mexican maid, Lydia, whom they turn over to the Border Patrol.13 In the second case, the poetry of an undocumented migrant, Yosimar Reyes, envisions how “illegal” subjects experience everyday life under the terrorizing state. This article proposes to link the deportation regime with representations of “illegal” migrant subjects to analyze how terrorizing governance impacts minoritarian peoples and their imaginary of citizenship. Solis and Reyes index the lives of undocumented people in light of deportation, and their aesthetic practices respond differently to the rule of law. On the one hand, the Mexican American playwright maps Latinidad through the imaginary of lawful violence when the play’s undocumented woman is turned over to an immigration agent in order to be expulsed. For her Mexican American employers, Lydia is expendable because she’s “illegal.” On the other hand, the undocumented poet does not prioritize a legal schema where undocumented women can be legally disappeared. Outside of the law, Reyes is more concerned with creating the spaces where the humanity and freedom of “illegal” people exist without question. Side by side, Latina/o theatre and poetics reveal the conflicting ways that minoritarian peoples respond to racial terror. Solis’s work has been celebrated for transcending the cultural and formal boundaries of contemporary American theatre. Lydia, for example, was nominated for a Pulitzer Prize in 2009. The play brings undocumented migrants to the stage in order to imagine what practices of everyday life are accessible to them, but the lives of “illegal” migrants extinguish when their U.S.-born Mexican American employers turn them over to the Border Patrol. Lydia’s racial schema sustains the legal parameters of citizenship benefiting the Mexican American family, and this same racial schema solidifies Solis’s own imaginary of American citizenship. Unlike artists endowed with legality, undocumented artists are rarely granted access to the majoritarian publics occupied by minoritarian artists like Solis. Reyes’s poetry, for example, responds to lawful violence in order to imagine freedom beyond state terror. While the Mexican American play has garnered critical attention for its representation of illegality, the undocumented artist creates art forms that envision life under illegality and beyond detention and disappearance. Ultimately, my argument is that if our meditations on immigration and freedom under a democracy are to imagine an alternate or altered form of law, we must position the “illegal” imaginaries of undocumented people at the center of philosophical thought. Democracy’s future does not lie within the confines of the state’s aberrant present, but in the present of those who live despite aberration. Disposable Women Anzaldúa’s metaphor for the U.S.-Mexico borderlands as “an open wound” rests on a question of power and racial terror. The only subjects worthy of “legitimate” existence in the border are those who know whiteness intimately, either as a white person or a non-white person whose life is sanctioned by whites. For Anzaldúa, those who are not akin to whiteness are “los atravesados,” the subjects who live with death beside them. Los atravesados are “the squint-eyed, the perverse, the queer, the troublesome, the mongrel, the mulatto, the half-breed, the half-dead; in short, those who cross over, pass over, or through the confines of the ‘normal’” to dwell in the borderlands illegitimately, despite the racial schema that renders them eligible for death.14 Crossed by the border or border crossers themselves, los atravesados know death intimately because they are “aliens—whether they possess documents or not, whether they’re Chicanos, Indians or Blacks.”15 The legitimacy that renders whites as legal inhabitants requires that nonwhites be made into “illegal” dwellers of the borderlands, regardless of their un/documented status. “Illegality,” like “legitimacy,” makes los atravesados into the subjects of death whose blood must run precisely because they are not white. The herida abierta brings migrants and other border dwellers into discourse by providing us with a language with which to understand the practices of racial violence that govern everyday life in the borderlands. Anzaldúa’s logic also exceeds linguistic metaphors when she locates illegality and its racial terror on the bodies of minoritarian subjects who are disappeared by order of the law: In the fields, la migra. My aunt saying, “No corran, don’t run. They’ll think you’re del otro lao.” In the confusion, Pedro ran, terrified of being caught. He couldn’t speak English, couldn’t tell them he was fifth generation American. Sin papeles –he did not carry his birth certificate to work in the fields. La migra took him away while we watched. Se lo llevaron. . . . They deported him to Guadalajara by plane.16 Natalie Cisneros is one of the few philosophers of immigration to take up Anzaldúa’s humanistic mantle.17 For Cisneros, Anzaldúa’s analysis of los atravesados “illustrates how normalizing functions of power operate in terms of the constitution of the ‘alien’ as a type of ‘abnormal subject’ that resists and blurs the juridical categories of ‘alien’ and ‘citizen’ in particular ways.”18 Pedro’s deportation exemplifies how racial terror is not the exception to the rule of law. In the context of the borderlands, violence is enacted through the bodies whose skin color marks us as “aliens” and “illegal” in the eyes of a law whose legitimacy necessitates the disposal and elimination of the people it has constituted unworthy of human life. Pedro is unfit for citizenship: he is a U.S.-born citizen who is nevertheless “constituted as a dangerous trespasser by his status as a fieldworker and by his visible non-whiteness and Spanish-speaking” when he is “identified as an ‘illegal alien’” and deported.19 La migra reads Pedro’s body as the antonym to whiteness because he is unable to vocalize his citizenship in English, and by reading him as the embodiment of alienness, the Border Patrol establishes that non-white subjects in the borderlands are made of a flesh that signifies abnormality and disposability. Since illegality entails the absence of proper documentation of U.S. citizenship, la migra also reads Pedro as “illegal” because his birth certificate was not placed anywhere on his body. As Cisneros argues, “even though [Pedro] is constituted as a ‘citizen’ by juridical discourse, he is constituted by biopolitical functions of power as an ‘illegal alien’ subject—as a dangerous individual who must be removed.”20 Pedro is “illegal” because he is not white. Since he is brown and “illegal,” la migra simply disposed of him in front of the other field workers so that they would see deportation in their own possible future. His deportation instructed the workers about the extent of la migra’s power to enact a form of lawful violence that would create a future cleansed of brown and black bodies. Like Pedro, they too can be taken away and disappeared. Like Pedro, they too will bleed. The similarity between our present and Borderlands/La Frontera is an uncanny one. What we are experiencing brings to life the scene where Pedro and those like him were warned of their impending disposal. DHS’ decision to close TPS, together with the ongoing DACA debates, serves as a warning to more than 1 million migrants: temporarily documented or not, your lives are expendable, and you will be removed.

#### Scene 2: La Frontera. The border es una herida abierta where the Third World grates against the first and bleeds. And before a scab forms it hemorrhages again, the lifeblood of two worlds merging to form the Borderlands.

Tamdgidi 8 (Mohammad H. Tamdgidi, Assistant Professor in Sociology, University of Massachusetts Boston. “I Change Myself, I Change the World”: Anzaldua’s Sociological Imagination in Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza. Humanity & Society V 34 N 4. November 1, 2008. //shree)

Anzaldúa’s thesis of global social change via radical self­knowledge and transformation is not an anecdotal or passing episode in her work. It is a continuing and central hypothesis that significantly inspired her Borderlands and later writings and informed much of her literary laboratory and social praxis. She reminded her readers emphatically of this thesis in Borderlands: My “awakened dreams” are about shifts. Thought shifts, reality shifts, gender shifts: one person metamorphoses into another in a world where people fly through the air, heal from mortal wounds. I am playing with my Self, I am playing with the world’s soul, I am the dialogue between my Self and el espíritu del mundo. I change myself, I change the world. (1987: 71) She further wrote: The struggle is inner: Chicano, indio, American Indian, mojado, mexicano, immigrant Latino, Anglo in power, working class Anglo, Black, Asian—our psyches resemble the bordertowns and are populated by the same people. The struggle has always been inner, and is played out in the outer terrains. Awareness of our situation must come before inner changes, which in turn come before changes in society. Nothing happens in the “real” world unless it first happens in the images in our heads. (Anzaldúa, 1987:87)In order to understand the paradoxical nature of this simultaneous “work” on self and global transformation, it is crucial to understand the paradigmatic significance Anzaldúa attributes to the problem of dualism as the root source of much of what’s wrong in human life under existing conditions. All major concepts in Anzaldúa’s thought, such as “borderlands,” “bridging,” “nepantla” and “nepantleras” (those who can travel across spiritual worlds), etc., are invented, borrowed, or revived to make possible both the understanding and the transcendence of dualistic modes of living, thinking, feeling, and sensing that permeate the deepest recesses of human self and global realities. The tragedies of human violence, war, exploitation, oppression, and alienation, are, at their roots, products of the violence of dualism. Anzaldúa’s critique of dualism is not a denial of the dialectical mode of development of phenomena in nature, society, and mind. What for her is a fundamental problem is that binaries become habitually rigidified, dogmatized, and rendered static, to the point where they become unbridgeable, creating lasting personal and broader social wounds. Healing involves a process of observation, questioning, and dialectical reengagement and “bridging” of rigidified binaries. In Anzaldúa’s view—and this is crucial to point out—what makes dualisms so difficult to heal and transform, leading to their becoming rigidified as habituated modes of thinking and behavior in the inner and global realms, is itself a product of the dualistic separation of conscious and subconscious minds. It is this splitting of waking consciousness from the subconscious mind, and the reification of the split as if given in nature (and brought on and perpetuated by specific social upbringing and modes of education), that helps reproduce and further entrench other modes of dualistic thinking, feeling, sensing, behaving, and relating. This ensemble of the immense variety of habituated dualisms subtly permeating human inner and global life is “the enemy within” that must be the target of the simultaneous work on the self and the world: The borders and walls that are supposed to keep the undesirable ideas out are entrenched habits and patterns of behavior; these habits and patterns are the enemy within. Rigidity means death. Only by remaining flexible is she able to stretch the psyche horizontally and vertically. La mestiza constantly has to shift out of habitual formations; from convergent thinking, analytical reasoning that tends to use rationality to move toward a single goal (a Western mode), to divergent thinking, characterized by movements away from set patterns and goals and toward a more whole perspective, one that includes rather than excludes. (Anzaldúa, 1987:79) The work of mestiza consciousness is to break down the subject­object duality that keeps her a prisoner and to show in the flesh and through the images in her work how duality is transcended. The answer to the problem between the white race and the colored, between males and females, lies in healing the split that originates in the very foundation of our lives, our culture, our languages, our thoughts. A massive uprooting of dualistic thinking in the individual and collective consciousness is the beginning of a long struggle, but one that could, in our best hopes, bring us to the end of rape, of violence, of war. (Anzaldúa, 1987:80)The massive, both subtle and complex, work of self and global transformation to end rape, violence, and war, is effectively conceptualized by Anzaldúa in terms of a massive project of uprooting habituated dualisms and planting healing seeds of integrative human experience. To recognize and change the manifestations of these in the most private recesses of oneself is at the same time an exercise in radical understanding and changing of the world. For this reason, in Anzaldúa one finds a sense that “size” does not matter. A radical transformation of an inner habit, as minute as an attitude, feeling, or bias, is deemed to have significant repercussions for larger, global, social processes. Witnessing how Anzaldúa’s own “work” on herself has shaped and influenced a generation of intellectuals and activists is an illustrative case in point. Living, as a Chicana Lesbian and Feminist, in the borderlands of dualistic social experiences provides Anzaldúa with an opportunity to show how the immense work can begin and be undertaken by her global public audience through the chronicling of her own efforts in writing and working on herself, by example. This in my view provides the key to understanding the transformative nature of Anzaldúa’s writings in general and in her Borderlands in particular. II. ANZALDÚA AND C. WRIGHT MILLS: THE CONTRASTING SOCIOLOGICAL IMAGINATIONSAnzaldúa’s thesis on the simultaneity of self and global transformations has close affinities with what C. Wright Mills called the sociological imagination (1959). In both, the central project is framed in terms of establishing and deepening a link between the personal and the global, between the private and the public, between biography and history. In both, the simultaneity of self­reflective awareness of micro and macro social processes is seen as key to the advancement of the sociological and the social emancipatory project. In his classic formulation of the concept “sociological imagination” (1959), Mills distinguished on the micro level between the “inner life” and the “external career” of the individual, and on the macro level between the contemporary society and its world­historical context. Anzaldúa’s sociological imagination takes more seriously at the micro level the inner, reflective, dimension of biographical inquiry into one’s personal troubles and, at the macro level, the broader world­historical dimension of human predicament to frame public issues—at times cast in the language of mythologies and spiritual symbolisms. However, Mills and Anzaldúa do not seem to part drastically in regard to recognizing the need to transcend the dualism of personal and global spacetimes. What set Anzaldúa apart are the intricate strategies she uses to practice her thesis of the simultaneity of self and global transformation and to transend the dualism of private and public realms through the very practice of weaving her words and writings. In what follows, I will briefly expand upon what may be characterized as the distinguishing features of Anzaldúan sociological imagination in contrast to that of Mills. Disciplinary Borderlands: Problematizing the “Sociological” ItselfIn Anzaldúa, the very “sociological” imagination itself, or the inherited or assumed “sociological” framework informing the imagination, does not escape borderlands analysis and transcendence. In other words, Anzaldúa’s sociological imagination is one that subjects the very premises of and about “sociology” to self­critical auto/biographical­historical scrutiny and transformation. In Mills, the project is more or less framed within disciplinary boundaries, i.e., in terms of what is presumed to be the “sociological” approach on the one hand, and of how the latter is situated within the context of social science discourse on the other hand. In Anzaldúa, the dualism of the academic cultures is itself broken down and transcended. Humanities and social scientific inquiry are seen as equally valid and necessary exercises in understanding and transforming the self and the world. This makes her sociology humanist in theory and practice. An important by­product of this disciplinary border­crossing by Anzaldúa is the empowerment of the individual vis­à­vis the world. In Mills, to be sociological involves the task of explaining the individual biography by its social “context,” of diverse forms of “human nature” by the social structures which “gives rise” to them, of knowledge by its “social origins.” This predeterministic, predictable, whole­determines­part, sociological imagination is quite readily problematized in the Anzaldúan formulation and practice. Although, as quoted above, Anzaldúa acknowledges that “awareness of our [social/historical] situation” must come before inner changes, she is aware that the “awareness of our [world­historical] situation” is itself, simultaneously, an inner experience—while also immediately noting that inner changes must precede changes in the world. This is why she begins by stating that “[t]he struggle is always inner” and follows this up by stressing that “[t]he struggle has always been inner, and is played out in the outer terrains” (1987:87). In Anzaldúa one finds a Pragmatist conception according to which the self and society are regarded as being twin­born and simultaneous in operation.The individual is thereby empowered to engage the “spirit of the world,” and by changing oneself, to change the world. The creative, chaotic, and unpredictable “playing” of the self by self is world­creating and dualism­shattering. In her view, the micro can determine the macro, the self can shape society, the individual can liberate oneself from the shackles of “social origins,” “social determinism,” and diverse forms of dualistic thinking, feeling, and being. It may be the case that, subconsciously, the self has been shaped by social structures; however, once consciousness of this state is achieved and ways of transcending it willfully learned and practiced, the self acquires the power not only to withstand those forces and global pressures, but also to give birth to new selves that are harbingers of alternative world orders. Anzaldúa’s writing, itself, is a demonstration of how she withstands conventions of the disciplines, and of writing and expression, to transcend artificial constructions of science, the arts, religion, mythology, philosophy, etc., in order to construct an alternative sociological imagination that is flexible, creative, and thereby transformative: …I am cultured because I am participating in the creation of yet another culture, a new story to explain the world and our participation in it, a new value system with images and symbols that connect us to each other and to the planet. Soy un amasamiento, I am an act of kneading, of uniting and joining that not only produces both a creature of darkness and a creature of light, but also a creature that questions the definitions of light and dark and gives them new meanings. (1987:81)Borderlands of Theorizing and Praxis Anzaldúa sees the very process of theory­building via writing itself as a transformative praxis. Liberatory theorizing and praxis, in other words, are simultaneous efforts, and not dichotomized in time­space. The transformative vision or practice is not one to be conceived of and undertaken as a “result” of sociologically imaginative analysis, but the process of the inquiry itself is deemed to be the very terrain of transformative struggle. One does not write to then shatter a State later; the very act of writing is State­shattering, and transformative of minute and subtle forms of “relations of ruling” (Smith, 1989, 1991) and carceral living (Foucault 1977; Tamdgidi 2007a). Writing is not just a call for developing and implementing a future liberatory vision; it is itself both, and simultaneously, a process of knowing and transforming the self and the world in the here­and­now. Writing is at the same time an exercise in private and public sociology. Anzaldúa’s sociological imagination is at the same time an imaginatively applied sociological1 practice: The writing is my whole life, it is my obsession. This vampire which is my talent does not suffer other suitors. Daily I court it, offer my neck to its teeth. This is the sacrifice that the act of creation requires, a blood sacrifice. For only through the body, through the pulling of flesh, can the human soul be transformed. And for images, words, stories to have this transformative power, they must arise from the human body—flesh and bone— and from the Earth’s body—stone, sky, liquid, soil. This work, these images, piercing tongue or ear lobes with cactus needle, are my offerings, are my Aztecan blood sacrifices. (1987:75)Borderlands is therefore simultaneously a chronicle of “workings” of Anzaldúa on her own inner private self, and her public work for global transformation. Self­liberation is at the same time an exercise in global transformation, and her writing serves both. This is her magic and “alchemy” at work. Anzaldúa reports that books, including Borderlands, not only “saved [her] sanity” but also involve efforts in activating, awakening, and making concrete and familiar, the alien elements of “shifting and multiple identity and integrity” residing in borderlands in order to refashion them consciously toward ends which involve “an exhilaration in being a participant in the further evolution of humankind, in being ‘worked’ on.” Borderlands, then, Anzaldúa writes, “speaks of my existence. My preoccupations with the inner life of the Self, and with the struggle of that Self amidst adversity and violation” (1987: Preface).Borderlands of Anti­ and Othersystemicity Anzaldúa’s writing is not just a landscape for antisystemic theorizing and practice, but also a terrain for creating new and alternative cultural and social systems and realities. She does not take as given the dualism of anti­ versus othersystemic2 movements. That is, she crosses back and forth the borderlands of what should not and should be, not rigidifying the negativity that may be frozen in a perpetual anti­status quo mode of activism. For her, the questioning of ‘what is’ is constantly juxtaposed to both how it should not be and to how it can or should be—especially to how it alternatively is, as exemplified by how Anzaldúa lives her vision of alternative world through her writing. Anzaldúa’s sociological imagination, in other words, is not just critical of what is, but also imaginatively envisages re­imagined and alternatively lived states of being in the self and in the world. But it is not enough to stand on the opposite river bank, shouting questions, challenging patriarchal, white conventions. A counterstance locks one into a duel of oppressor and oppressed; locked in mortal combat, like the cop and the criminal, both are reduced to a common denominator of violence. The counterstance refutes the dominant culture’s views and beliefs, and, for this, it is proudly defiant. All reaction is limited by, and dependent on, what it is reacting against. Because the counterstance stems from a problem with authority—outer as well as inner—it’s a step toward liberation from cultural domination. But it is not a way of life. At some point, on our way to a new consciousness, we will have to leave the opposite bank, the split between the two mortal combatants somehow healed so that we are on both shores at once and, at once, see through serpent and eagle eyes. Or perhaps we will decide to disengage from the dominant culture, write it off altogether as a lost cause, and cross the border into a wholly new and separate territory. Or we might go another route. The possibilities are numerous once we decide to act and not react. (1987:78­79) Deconstruct, construct. (1987:82 )I write the myths in me, the myths I am, the myths I want to become. The word, the image and the feeling have a palatable energy, a kind of power. (1987:71) Anzaldúa’s vision, therefore, is not just antisystemic, but more so othersystemic and utopistic (Wallerstein 1998), for it seeks not just to overthrow, but also to build alternative visions and realities. Moreover, Anzaldúa’s vision is utopistic in a cross­cultural way, highly aware of the different ways the East and the West conceive of the utopian visions of what could or must be. This comparative/integrative vision is deeply built into Anzaldúa’s simultaneous self/globe­changing strategy, in fact. For her, it is impossible to seek the good (broader) society, without a simultaneous effort in seeking the good “society” within. One is conditioned and simultaneous with the other. They are twin­born. There is no separation of means and ends, in either direction. Movement Borderlands... Nuestra alma el trabajo, the opus, the great alchemical work; spiritual mestizaje, a “morphogenesis”5 …5. To borrow chemist Ilya Prigogine’s theory of “dissipative structures.” Prigogine discovered that substances interact not in predictable ways as it was taught in science, but in different and fluctuating ways to produce new and more complex structures, a kind of birth he called “morphogenesis,” which created unpredictable innovations. —Anzaldúa (1987:81 and endnote pp. 97­98)In Anzaldúa, utopianism, mysticism, and science are mixed, and integral to one another. Her cross­movement vision and strategy allow her to draw upon the rich reservoir of a multitude of cultural, spiritual, and intellectual traditions to pursue her work on the self and the world. She is highly conscious of her inheritance from and affinities with diverse social and cultural movements. She identifies with them for they provide distinctly different elements to her humanist project. Especially, she makes significant effort to critically break down the dualisms of mystical and utopian movements, and both in the context of the intellectual movements she seeks to build within and outside the academy. Hers is a utopystic (cf. Tamdgidi 2007b, Forthcoming) agenda, transgressing the borderlands of utopianism, mysticism, and scientific discourse. Anzaldúa’s sociological imagination is not only intentionally cross­disciplinary, but as well cross­movement. She is not just critical of disciplinary boundaries and of (class, race, gender, …) movement boundaries; she considers those boundaries themselves as constructs that contribute to the maintenance of the status quo. In the very fabric of her writing, therefore, she constructs and integrates multiple disciplinary and practical modes of knowing and movement allegiance, being quite weary of being fragmented into this or that movement:I am a wind­swayed bridge, a crossroads inhabited by whirlwinds. Gloria, the facilitator, Gloria the mediator, straddling the walls between abysses. “Your allegiance is to La Raza, the Chicano movement,” say my Black and Asian friends. “Your allegiance is to your gender, to women,” say the feminists. Then there’s my allegiance to the Gay movement, to the socialist revolution, to the New Age, to magic and the occult. And there’s my affinity to literature, to the world of the artist. What am I? A third world lesbian feminist with Marxist and mystic leanings. They would chop me up into little fragments and tag each piece with a label. (Anzaldúa, in Moraga and Anzaldúa, 1981:205)Linguistic and Cultural Borderlands Then there is the crossing of the borderlands of language—English, Castilian Spanish and North Mexican, verbal and symbolic, in prose and poetry, etc. All modes of communication that have permeated her inner life are awakened and consciously activated in Borderlands so as to both illuminate as well as intentionally dismantle habituated communication borders. The book must be seen as first and foremost as an intrapersonal dialogue among her own “shifting and multiple” identities. The book is, in other words, a work in self­understanding and self­transformation, a writing for the self which, if done effectively turns out to be, for Anzaldúa, also world­transforming. Anzaldúa’s sociological imagination is consciously cross­cultural, and open to multiple modes of knowing the self and society. Her mestiza consciousness is highly critical of monolithic and monological modes of knowing the self and the world. In contrast to a sociological tradition or imagination suspecting non­western cultural traditions and symbolic systems, Anzaldúa intentionally seeks to resurrect and embrace the traditional in her writing so that she could demonstrate the value of her nepantilism as the ability to travel across seemingly separate(d) worlds of meanings and cultural symbols:In a constant state of mental nepantilism, an Aztec word meaning torn between ways, la mestiza is a product of the transfer of the cultural and spiritual values of one group to another. Being tricultural, monolingual, bilingual, or multilingual, speaking a patois, and in a state of perpetual transition, the mestiza faces the dilemma of the mixed breed: which collectivity does the daughter of a darkskinned mother listen to? (1987: 78)The new mestiza copes by developing a tolerance for contradictions, a tolerance for ambiguity. She learns to be an Indian in Mexican culture, to be Mexican from an Anglo point of view. She learns to juggle cultures. She has a plural personality, the good the bad and the ugly, nothing rejected, nothing abandoned. Not only does she sustain contradictions, she turns the ambivalence into something else. (1987:79)Stylistic Borderlands: The Significance of Conscious and Subconscious Modes of Knowing and TransformingThe use of multilingual modes of communication in Anzaldúa’s writing is, of course, evident. However, equally, if not more, significant is how she consciously uses symbolic language to communicate with the subconscious mind beyond the waking consciousness of everyday knowledge. Images and symbolic language are borrowed not simply for the sake of allegiance to her cultural heritage and identity, but especially to enable the crossing of conscious and unconscious awareness in her own inner life and in the inner lives of her readers. Anzaldúa is highly aware and skillful in using various linguistic modes in order to communicate across her intellectual, emotional, and sensual selves and those of her audience who have subconsciously internalized and perpetuate dualistic modes of living in the self and in the world:An image is a bridge between evoked emotion and conscious knowledge: words are the cables that hold up the bridge. Images are more direct, more immediate than words, and closer to the unconscious. Picture language precedes thinking in words: the metaphorical mind precedes analytical consciousness. (1987: 69)The foregoing provide glimpses into how Anzaldúa’s sociological imagination goes beyond the dialectics of personal troubles and public issues as found in Mills, and consciously questions the dualistic modes of imagining and engaging the disciplinary, theory/practice, anti/othersystemic, cross­cultural, cross­movement, cross­linguistic, and cross­stylistic sub/conscious borderlands as well. Of equal significance, however, is also how Anzaldúa questions the assumed singularity of the self in advancing her sociological imagination. For this is may be helpful to bridge to insights from another cultural tradition and teaching.III. ANZALDÚA AND GURDJIEFF: THE MULTIPLICITY OF SELVES AND THE SOCIOLOGICAL IMAGINATION… He added, grimly, that he was in no sense joking when he said that time was short. Further, he said that history had already proven to us that such tools as politics, religion, and any other organized movements which treated man [one] “in the mass” and not as individual beings, were failures. That they would always be failures and that the separate, distinct growth of each individual in the world was the only possible solution….” (Peters, Boyhood with Gurdjieff, 1964: 160­161).Man has no individual I. But there are, instead, hundreds and thousands of separate small I’s, very often entirely unknown to one another, never coming into contact, or, on the contrary, hostile to each other, mutually exclusive and incompatible. Each minute, each moment, man is saying or thinking, ‘I.’ And each time his I is different. Just now it was a thought, now it is a desire, now a sensation, now another thought, and so on, endlessly. Man [one] is a plurality. Man’s [one’s] name is legion. (Gurdjieff, quoted in Ouspensky 1949: 59)

#### Scene 3: Lexington, Kentucky. The struggle is inner. Chicano, indio, American Indian, mexicano, immigrant Latino, Anglo in power, working class Anglo, Black, Asian – our psyches resemble the bordertowns and are populated by the same people. The struggle has always been inner, and is played out in outer terrains. Awareness of our situation must come before inner changes, which in turn comes before changes in society. Nothing happens in the “real” world unless it first happens in the imagines in our heads.

Lopez 19 (Estefany Lopez is a Ph.D. student studying English at New York University’s Graduate School of Arts and Science. She received her B.A. in English from Florida International University (FIU). Curando La Herida: Shamanic Healing and Language in Gloria Anzaldúa’s Borderlands/La Frontera. Pathways: A Journal of Humanistic and Social Inquiry. V1 N1. //shree)

Both these aesthetic tactics use language creatively to destabilize hegemonic systems of signification; in other words, Anzaldúa writes from the borderlands to heal the toxic binary thinking that privileges the U.S, white, and male over the Mexican, non-white, and female. The figurative and performative strategies in Borderlands orient the reader towards transgressing structural binaries and reintegrating the binaries’ divorced halves into a whole . With this 1 approach, Anzaldúa advances a monistic shamanic worldview and advocates for the dismantling of binary thinking. Shamanic tropes and conceptions of language are integral to Anzaldúa’s approach, as shamanic philosophy holds that language can literally and materially transform realities. Anzaldúa’s shamanic healing project throughout Borderlands uses language to transform and construct more equitable realities and operates within a radically effective understanding of language and discourse. Gloria Anzaldúa alludes to her shamanic inspiration in “Tllili, Tlapalli: The Path of the Red and Black Ink”, the chapter of Borderlands which is concerned with her writing process. Here, she directly invokes a parallel between the roles of the shaman and the writer, explaining that storytelling has the ability to transform writers and readers: “the writer, as shape-changer, is a nahual, a shaman” (Borderlands 88). Writing, thus, becomes a process of transmutation not only of words into images and narratives, but also of the storyteller and the listener. For Anzaldúa, this means that writing can be used to heal trauma both in herself and in her readers: In reconstructing the traumas behind the images, I make “sense” of them, and once they have “meaning” they are changed, transformed. It is then that writing heals me, brings me great joy (Borderlands 92). Through creative expression, the writing shaman reshapes and reconceptualizes trauma, which in turn allows for healing. In engaging the author’s theorization of trauma, the reader undergoes the same transformation. Thus, the text becomes a common space where writers and readers, through creative inversions, can reimagine a communal pain so that it becomes its own cure. The healing potential of writing stems from a shamanic philosophy of language. AnaLouise Keating describes what she calls the “poet shaman aesthetic” in her article “Speculative Realism, Visionary Pragmatism, and Poet-Shaman Aesthetics in Gloria Anzaldúa — and Beyond.” She writes that Anzaldúa’s aesthetics lends words “causal force”: As in shamanic worldviews and indigenous theories and practices— in which words, images, and things are intimately interwoven and the intentional, ritualized performance of specific, carefully selected words shifts reality— poet-shaman aesthetics enables us to enact and concretize transformation (52). In line with shamanic conceptions, Anzaldúa’s language is not merely representational, nor merely metaphorical or poetic; it is material, “causal. Language can have material(izing) force” (Keating 52). In other words, Anzaldúa wills realities into being through language. The shamanic view that language not only constitutes but materializes reality is further developed by Christopher Bracken in Magical Criticism: The Recourse to Savage Philosophy. Bracken 2 explains that shamans “regard signs as vehicles for the transmission of forces as if the elaboration of discourse were enough to effect changes in the nondiscursive world” (1). As a result, shamanic philosophy of language posits a material connection between signifier and signified, in which a word employed affects material entities. Power Intrusions Reading Anzaldúa’s essay “Metaphors in the Tradition of a Shaman” alongside James Geary’s work I is an Other: The Secret Life of Metaphor offers an explanation to how metaphors fit into Anzaldúa’s aesthetic ideals. Anzaldúa writes that her negative mental representations of reality caused her to become sick: “imagination acted upon [her] own body” and her mental images “communicated with tissues, organ, and cell to effect change” (Metaphors 121). As a result, she sensed the power of words and images, and recognized the need to “control the metaphors” she used to conceptualize her reality (Metaphors 121). Anzaldúa characterizes these words and images— and the material conditions they underpin— as illnesses, “lo que daña” (Metaphors 121). Here, “illness” refers to anything that “unbalances” individuals or communities; in this case, Anzaldúa extends it to racism, sexism, bigotry, and inequality (Metaphors 121). In describing the physiological effect of words and images on her health, Anzaldúa erodes Cartesian dualist views of the body and mind as separate, as well as the larger Western distinction between abstraction and materiality. In Anzaldúa’s words, metaphors and symbols “concretize the spirit and etherealize the body”; by transforming spirit into material and body into abstract, Anzaldúa shows how language can make apparent the fluidity and interconnectedness of supposedly antithetical categories (Borderlands 97). Metaphor introduces ambiguity and overlap between those binaries which are reputed to be diametrically opposed to one another; thus, the binary dissolves. Her views hearken back to animistic, shamanic beliefs which contend that all is unified and interconnected, that physical ailments can have a nonphysical source, and that words and images are just as material as sticks and stones. Given this framework of language, words can be deployed either as weapons or cures; connotations, context, and usage determine which of those roles the word assumes. To put plainly, it is not the word itself that determines whether it heals or hurts, because signifiers themselves do not ‘mean’ anything; because all meaning is contextual, it is the discourse surrounding a word that lends it its powers. This discourse is calcified by metaphors, which link words and concepts within our cognitive schema. Geary describes how metaphors form connections between words, and how these connections transform realities. Metaphors are figurative devices that describe a thing in terms of something else, thus drawing parallels between them that elicit associations and meaning. Geary represents metaphor with the equation “X = Y”, suggesting that words do not ‘equate’ themselves but always interrelate to other words through metaphorical thinking (8). When metaphorical associations are repeated enough in speech, they become encoded into constructed meaning. For example, the word blue has been associated with sadness for so long that the expression “I’m feeling blue”—literally nonsensical—makes perfect sense. Blue = sad as metaphor has pervaded speech to the point of synonymy; thus, the metaphor has a fixed quality which Geary argues makes it an “extinct metaphor”, or a metaphor so deeply embedded in language it even ceases to be considered metaphorical and becomes commonplace, obvious, and even “literally true” (25). Geary’s extinct metaphors parallel Anzaldúa’s discussion of “dead metaphors” (Metaphors 122). Anzaldúa writes that the aforementioned illnesses of society are the result of old, dead, metaphors. If bigoted discourse is an illness, then metaphors are the pathogen carriers.[CSA4] Dead metaphors are so deeply codified into language itself that they resist change, thus simultaneously cementing and disseminating the power structure that created them. Anzaldúa argues that the only way to cure this illness is to replace the dead metaphors with new ones (Metaphors 122). In other words, counteracting old discourse with new metaphors can heal societal malaise, especially when dead metaphors fortify the oppressive dominant discourse of the ruling class. The healing engendered by new metaphors functions as shamanic healing by inducing “altered states of consciousness conducive to self-healing” (Metaphors 122). In other words, because new metaphors force us to restructure our perceptions of the world, they allow us to build new realities that circumvent the societal illness caused by dead metaphors and establish healthier discourse. One of Anzaldúa’s most radical new metaphors is her reimagining of the border. Throughout the work, Anzaldúa re-conceptualizes the border not as a partition but as a wound. This new metaphor of the border undermines white supremacist discourse surrounding the border and posits a new ontological relationship between the U.S and Mexico. Before examining how Anzaldúa reimagines the border, we must first look at how it is traditionally conceptualized. The U.S./Mexican Border is a dead/extinct metaphor that perpetuates U.S hegemony’s subjugation of Mexicans and Chicanos. A border is defined as a separation between two distinct entities. It is an arbitrary line drawn on a map that signifies where one thing ends and another begins. This line on the map does not represent itself; rather, it metaphorizes an unbreachable limitation, an outline of bodies which necessarily do not overlap or interact. Because it is arbitrarily designated, the border superficially imposes the rigid categories of “Us” and “Them” onto a landscape that is fluid and continuous. Lastly, in a context of disproportionately held power, the border is framed from the dominant view as “that which keeps others out.” The border manifests the illnesses of tribalism and binary thinking, establishing a Manichean allegory that serves white supremacy. The border metaphor is arbitrarily constructed; yet, its economy as a metaphor is ever-present in the experience of the people it affects. This is clear 3 in the history of the borderlands, the interstitial space between the U.S and Mexico. Despite the legal decisiveness of the border, the cultural distinction between its two sides is not clear-cut, and is steeped in political conflict. Communities along the border are caught between these two different entities, alienated and doubly disowned. This is seen in “The Homeland, Aztlán,” the opening chapter of Borderlands, which chronicles the historical developments of the region. In dominant U.S. discourse, Mexico is perceived as the Other, and Mexicans as ‘aliens’; thus, even if the people of the borderlands have resided there for centuries, they are rendered strangers in their own ancestral home. Land disputes left Chicanos as “atravesados”, people “jerked out by the roots, truncated, disemboweled, dispossessed, and separated from identity and history” (Borderlands 25, 30). This is evoked when Anzaldúa’s mother is barred from entering her ancestral cemetery: Mama Locha had asked that we bury her there beside her husband, El cementerio estaba cercado… We couldn’t even visit the grave, let alone bury her there. Today, it is still padlocked. The sign reads: Keep out. Trespassers will be shot (Borderlands 30). Displacement within one’s homeland creates neurosis caused by un-belonging and dispossession. The border as “that which keeps others out,” precipitates this illness. As Anzaldúa identifies the problems of the border, she re-metaphorizes the border as a wound; this new metaphor paves the way towards healing. The new border metaphor emerges not as a split between two, but a wound on one collective body: The U.S-Mexican border es una herida abierta where the Third World grates against the first and bleeds… A border is a dividing line, a narrow strip along a steep edge. A borderland is a vague and undetermined place created by the emotional residue of an unnatural boundary (Borderlands 25). In this passage, the border is described as a wound essentially slashing a body in two, suggesting an ontological shift in assessing the U.S-Mexico divide. Rather than describing an essential binary opposition, the new metaphor figures the border as pathology. The imagery of the border as injury suggests that U.S and Mexico are fragmented parts of a once unified whole, and that the injury inflicted is unnatural and undesirable. This new metaphor brings urgent awareness to the border, forcing us to reconceptualize the relationship between these two nations and cultures. In essence, the border—the othering of Mexicans and Chicanos— changes from a marker of difference into an injustice towards a shared body. Once this trauma is recognized, there is an ethical imperative to heal the body by repairing its wound. Removing the old toxic metaphors by the addition of new healing metaphors echoes the shamanic practice of extracting harmful intrusions. In The Way of the Shaman, Michael Harner describes a practice in which shamans heal by “sucking” out harmful intrusions from the body. An intrusion is, like a “communicable disease”, transmitted between people, and is described as a psychic/physiological injury which is inflicted on others by “eruptions” of negativity such as anger and hostility (Harner 116). For example, a jealous glare is often said to transmit a curse; however, the concept of harmful intrusion can also encompass something like the psychological harm of racist speech on a person of color. Interestingly, Harner uses the word “communicable”, which may not only refer to diseases passed by direct contact, but also implies “that which can be communicated”; this secondary interpretation resonates with our discussion of words as material, and more specifically, as pathogen carrier. In this case, the dead and damaging metaphors act as an intrusion on the body and must be removed and replaced. Anzaldúa performs the shamanic practice of removing intrusions on a macro scale, in which the affected body is the U.S and Mexico and the harmful intrusion is the hostility, fear, and tribalism materialized in the border. Ridding ourselves of this wound requires resituating the border within a new conceptual schema that isn’t oppositional, Manichean, and unjust. The border as wound metaphor is Anzaldúa’s poet-shaman aesthetics in practice: the shared trauma of a violently imposed border is synthesized through metaphor, and from the acknowledgment of the trauma emerges an urgent need to dismantle the toxic, white supremacist discourse surrounding the border. Speaking in Tongues Anzaldúa’s use of metaphor is deeply steeped in shamanic philosophies of language and healing praxis. Similar inspirations from shamanic philosophy also permeate the form of Borderlands itself. The polyglot, intertextual structure of Borderlands is performative of Anzaldúa’s reconciliatory thematic. By using multiple languages in the text, and often in the same sentence, Anzaldúa gives voice to the ethos of the borderlands and expresses its languages, English, and Spanish, as they interact in one liminal space. If metaphors reconfigure entities by merging them with their supposed opposites, then the simultaneous presence of many languages destabilizes fixed meaning and linearity, performing the productive interplay of cultures which is characteristic of the borderlands. To borrow from Doris Sommer’s Bilingual Aesthetics, multilingualism challenges a dominant language’s monopoly on meaning. Anzaldúa’s combination of languages in the text gives voice to the particular trauma of the mestiza, and performs the reintegration of the U.S and Mexico from binary into the monad of shamanic cosmology. The introduction to Doris Sommer’s Bilingual Aesthetics, “Invitation,” examines the aesthetic value of bilingualism; when applied to Anzaldúa’s Borderlands, it becomes apparent how Anzaldúa’s multilingual approach is productive to her goal of shifting realities through language. Sommer writes: More than one language is a supplement, not a deficiency. It is a dangerous supplement to monolingualism, whether the addition amounts to two languages or many. Bilingualism overloads mono systems... the underlying goal of thinking about these overloads as intellectual, artistic, and ethical enhancements will be to open public debate beyond this failing standard of monolingual assimilation (xi-xii). Monolinguistic systems of signification establish an uncontested grasp on how we conceptualize reality; supplementing this system another language (indeed, a new system) jolts us out of complacency and invites us to reevaluate the discourse we have come to accept as given. Bilingualism, then, challenges fixed meaning by providing a different linguistic framework through which meaning is conceptualized. Every language, owed to its singular development, context, and structure, contains its own world sense. To craft a bilingual text, then, is to weave between world senses; any multilingual text is always already an intertextual text, as it cannot be read without cross-referencing world senses. This cross-referencing makes linear reading 4 impossible, and deviates from the centralizing, homogenizing epistemology of white supremacy. Polyglossia is one of the pinnacles of mestiza consciousness and hinges on an understanding that the Borderlands is a hybridized place whose ethos is not fully expressible by either English or Spanish alone. The simultaneous presence of many languages challenges hegemonic accounts of U.S culture as supreme and authoritative. Thus, the presence of multiple languages in the text performs the meeting of cultures, the ambiguity, and inclusivity that will heal the wound of the Borderlands. The supplement of a second language paves the way for language play and creative, divergent thinking in what Doris Sommer calls “bilingual games” (Sommer xi-xii). This divergent thinking enables deviation from binarism and allows for connections to be made across languages. Cross-lingual play accesses mestiza consciousness by generating new meanings and accessing nonlinear means of representation. Anzaldúa utilizes this approach in “La consciencia de la Mestiza” when she makes a across-linguistic metaphor: Soy un amasamiento, I am an act of kneading, of uniting and joining that not only has produced both a creature of darkness and a creature of light, but also a creature that questions the definitions of light and dark and gives them new meanings (Borderlands 103). Here, there is a crosslinguistic punning of the word amasamiento, which is Spanish for “kneading” but also suggestive of the English word “amass.” The description which follows folds in both kneading and amassing imagery, in which Anzaldúa is an amalgamation of different cultures— and their corresponding languages, who then creates her own new mestizaje culture from those components. Here, it is clear that the polyglossia of the text unlocks a spontaneous logic that explores concepts that are difficult to pinpoint within either language alone. As such, the text unites the cultures which underpin the different languages, allowing the free play of the languages to give rise naturally to mestiza culture. This intersects interestingly with Anzaldúa’s reference to glossolalia in one of her most passionate essays, “Speaking in Tongues: A Letter to 3rd World Women”, in which she describes the challenges women of color face writing in an intellectual climate that privileges white male cultural production. Because the voices of women of color do not conform to white male discursive and aesthetic practices, and do not serve hegemonic metanarratives of patriarchy and white supremacy, they are delegitimized and taboo. From the white male frame of reference, the woman of color is unintelligible: Our [women of color] speech, too, is inaudible. We speak in tongues like the outcast and the insane… The white man speaks: Perhaps if you scrape the dark off your face. Maybe if you bleach your bones [you could write]. Stop speaking in tongues, stop writing left-handed. Don’t cultivate your colored skins nor tongues of fire if you want to make it in a right-handed world (“Speaking” 165-166). In a monolinguistic system of signification based on white, male, Anglo-American values, validation for women writers of color is conditional upon their intellectual conformity to hegemony. Speaking in tongues, then, is a refusal to abide by those terms and a reclamation by the woman of color of a subversive discourse that is devalued in the mainstream. In “Shamanic Urgency and Two-Way Movement as Writing Style in the Works of Glorian Anzaldúa”, Betsy Dahm explores Anzaldúa’s usage of the term: Referencing religious application, speaking in tongues can be interpreted as babbling incoherent nonsense… depending on one’s perspective. Speaking in tongues can also refer to an unknown and/or sacred language (16). 5 Glossolalia, or speaking in tongues, is an ecstatic religious experience in which a participant begins to speak in indiscernible speech. From a monolingual perspective, Anzaldúa’s speech is garbled and nonsensical; therefore, from the vantage point of dominant discourse, Anzaldúa is speaking in tongues. Yet, from a bilingual aesthetic perspective, we understand that not all words have translations in other languages and that cross-lingual play can yield interesting and novel insights. Thus, from Anzaldúa’s position within the Borderlands, her speaking in tongues is not nonsense, but rather accessing a different nonlinear self-expression that arises between languages. In the same sense that glossolalia occurs in liminal states of consciousness, Anzaldúa’s bilingual speech speaks to the trauma and the ingenuity and generativity of a liminal identity. As she slips across world senses, Anzaldúa speaks in tongues that institutionalized power cannot understand or accept. As such, the glossolalia generates the new language o the mestizaje, a language that is incoherent to those who do not wish to understand hybridity, but is spiritually and materially transformative to those who embrace mestiza consciousness. If shaman philosophy holds that language can transform realities, Anzaldúa’s intertextual form shows us what healing the border wound might look like as it performs an emerging mestiza consciousness. Conclusion Shamanic influences are apparent in Anzaldúa’s work, regarding both her use of metaphor and the performativity of her multilingual text. Interestingly, shamanic philosophy of language does not fit neatly into a western paradigm. In a western context, two main philosophies of language are prevalent: the logocentric or western metaphysical model and the poststructuralist model. When examined alongside these philosophies of language, shamanic philosophy is simultaneously more conservative and more radical than either logocentrism or poststructuralism. Amidst this tension, it becomes apparent that, as Bracken argues, we still have a lot to learn from our so-called “savage” philosophers, and that Anzaldúa’s framework holds value and immense potential. As Bracken explains, in shamanic philosophy, “signs have a “real” and “physical” connection with things” and as such, “physical forces can be deployed by discursive means” (2-3). In other words, when a word is spoken, the latent “mana”, or force, of the word is activated and a change in the physical world manifests (Bracke 1). A helpful analogy would be a voodoo doll: the voodoo doll represents a person in the physical world, and changes done to the doll affect the real person; similarly, shamanic belief holds that language is materially connected to and affects physical realities. Thus, in shamanic philosophy, the relationship between a signifier and the signified is neither purely abstract nor purely arbitrary. On the other hand, logocentrism holds language to be an abstract tool of communication that conveys transparent meaning about a transcendent and objective reality outside of language. Like logocentrism, shamanic language attributes to words an essence, mana, that links words to the things they represent in a transparent, 1:1 relationship. This essentializing tendency of shamanic philosophy is reflected in some of Anzaldúa’s writings. For instance, Anzaldúa writes that she “questions the definitions of light and dark and gives them new meanings”, but she doesn’t question the existence of the categories light and dark themselves as essentially existing (Borderlands, 103). In the shamanic view, words and physical realities are parallel; thus, if the linguistic categories exist, the material categories exist also. While it is possible to change linguistic categories and thus change reality under the shamanic view, the essential connection between signifier and signified remains intact even if the categories change. However, shaman philosophy differs from logocentrism in that its signifiers are transformative rather than merely descriptive of an external reality, and are not abstract but material. Language is not necessarily bound to reproduce the hegemonic discourse, but is always capable of generating new systems of signification, and thus new realities. In this last regard, shamanic philosophy echoes the poststructuralist claim that language constitutes reality. Poststructuralism holds that signs are arbitrary and interrelated to other signs in an endless chain of différance; rather than the positive identification of logocentrism, poststructuralism posits that things are negatively defined by what they are not. As a result, there is no understanding of the world as separate from language. The shaman goes further and says language not only constitutes, but always reconfigures reality not just perceptually, but also materially. Keating writes: in poet-shaman aesthetics, words do not simply point to this externalized material reality in some correspondence-type mode. Words neither serve merely as a veil between ourselves and a more real (that is, more tangibly material) world nor create our reality in some poststructuralist approach (i.e., the "linguistic turn"...). My claim is far more extreme: in poet-shaman aesthetics, words have causal force; words embody the world; words are matter; words become matter (52). If logocentrism holds that language is abstract, and poststructuralism holds it is constitutive of a world, yet arbitrary, then shamanic philosophy holds it to be material and intentional. Anzaldúa’s philosophy of language, in typical Borderlands fashion, is irreducible to the either/or binary that characterizes the western debate. Within the western context, shamanic philosophy remains ambiguous; however, shamanic language is worth revisiting due to its radically affective implications, and its potential to actualize the goals of mestiza consciousness. The poet-shaman challenges us to consider that a discourse being constructed doesn’t mean that it isn’t, in a meaningful and physical sense, still very “real”. More so than logocentrism and poststructuralism, shamanic conceptions of language emphasize the lived experience of discourse. Under this view, words have material consequences and are intimately interwoven into daily life; if language is material, and can change a subject’s emotional, psychological, and physical well-being, the shaman manipulates the materializing properties of language to envision a new reality that is free of illness, that does not harm but rather empowers. This reimagining is central to the mestiza consciousness Anzaldúa describes in the closing chapter of Borderlands. The mestiza consciousness is a new culture based on tolerance of ambiguity, hybridity, and plurality; this culture is realized by “by creating a new mythos— that is, a change in the way we perceive reality, the way we see ourselves, and the ways we behave— la mestiza creates a new consciousness” (102). In other words, generating new subversive metaphors, new systems of signification, and new realities offers a new paradigm which undermines US hegemony. Finally, the poet-shaman delivers the tools for transformation to the mestiza herself. The poet-shaman is an optimist, maintaining that rebel voices can change the world. Anzaldúa writes “people in possession of the vehicles of communication are, indeed, in partial possession of their lives (Metaphors 123)”. While language can never be fully possessed, Anzaldúa’s aesthetics invite the disenfranchised to grapple with their oppressor’s definitions and create their own. Shamanic philosophy empowers those who have been marginalized and excluded from dominant discourse to participate in the formation of a more just society and an emerging mestiza consciousness.

#### to hear growers through their organization representatives

#### sing,

#### oops, i mean testify before osha, without guitar or violin,

#### the sadness of their song brings sudden tears.

#### -the economics of the whole thing – they begin,

#### -we already have adequate codes.

#### uh? local and state, that is.

#### we do not need the feds.

#### migrants are not forced to live in those camps.

#### they can live elsewhere if they want to.

#### housing does not come with the job.

#### why, if it becomes economically unfeasible

#### we will shut down the camps.

#### you know that all of this is forcing us

#### to bring about mechanization that much sooner.

#### if standards are not enforced

#### it really doesn’t matter which are applied.

#### -the size of the room is adequate.

#### the flies are adequate.

#### the nonexistent toilets are adequate.

#### the lack of privacy is adequate.

#### but who defines “adequate”?

#### where, pray tell, are the affected parties?

#### they are in the fields, working, of course.

#### they are not in the forum room of the eugene hotel

#### in eugene, oregon,

#### that’s for sure.

#### -i grew up in a place close to a bran

#### and look at me, i am quite healthy.

#### hotels do not want the migrants

#### because they tear up the place.

#### says the wife of a grower.

#### more tears, my lord.

#### for god’s sake, change the damn attitudes

#### and screw the regulations for temporary labor camp violations.[[1]](#endnote-1)

#### Translation counteracts the monolinguistic view imposed by colonial governments – it embraces the liminal space between La Frontera as its own political project.

Claramonte 21 (Carmen Africa Vidal Claramonte, Catedrática de Universidad en la Universidad de Salamanca, “Translating in the contact zone: The one and a halfers,” <https://www-jbe-platform-com.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/docserver/fulltext/10.1075/tis.20098.vid/tis.20098.vid.pdf?expires=1632775119&id=id&accname=harvard%2F1&checksum=4EF33DAB11883B05DC9194F101EEE7D8//af>)

The one-and-a-halfers are translated beings. Through their mestizo language, they make us hear “the ear of the other” (Derrida 1982/1985). “The condition of the migrant is the condition of the translated being. He or she moves from a source language and culture to a target language and culture, so that translation takes place both in the physical sense of movement or displacement and in the symbolic sense of the shift from one way of speaking, writing about and interpreting the world to another” (Cronin 2006:45). In these circumstances, the translator needs “to go beyond binary oppositions to an understanding of postcolonial society as a space of negotiated identities, a space of translation,” a space that “is never simply horizontal” but requires “a kind of ‘doubleness’ in writing; a temporality of representation that moves between cultural formations and social processes without a centred causal logic” (Bhabha 1994:141). Ilan Stavans (2003, 2008), who is the author of translations into Spanglish such as Don Quixote or Little Príncipe, writes in what he calls “la jerga loca” (Stavans 2003): The translator is also an artist, and, in a universe where the clone is as important as the source, his role is to shine by spotlighting the artist’s talent. In that sense, the translator is a parasite of sorts: he lives off someone else. But he also allows the artist to flourish, to be freed from his own cultural and linguistic imprisonment, and in this sense he is a liberator […] To translate is to open up, to allow a text to travel. (Stavans in Sokol 2004:86, 94) Given that theirs is a type of literature that reflects contemporary hybridization, translation inherently defines these translated beings: Ours is a universe infused with translations. From the conversation with a longdistance operator, a taxi driver, a tourist, and a newly-arrived immigrant, to the browsing of foreign channels on our cable network, the pleasure of a novel drafted in another language, to the debate on bilingual education and “English Only” and “English First”[…], ours is a universe inundated by translation. Increasingly, it is everywhere you go. Yet we are fixated on the fact that **the degree of encounter in translation is dissatisfying, that something is always lost**. It surely is, **but, as far as I’m concerned, something is also won, so to speak**. Who are we when we are translated? Has our self been adulterated, deformed, and reinvented? Might it have been improved, perhaps? (Stavans in Sokol 2004:84) It is not a matter of merely choosing a “pure” language, but one that transmits the complex, hybrid and intricate feelings that one has when living in-between two cultures; a language that gives voice to those silenced by power (Stavans 1996/2001, 187–203). The major challenge for the translator is how to transform the text without imposing a specific point of view, how to achieve intercultural heteroglossia, Anzaldúa’s “linguistic terrorism, Chávez-Silverman’s “killer crónicas,” Tato Laviera’s “mixturao,” or the orality reflected in the writings of Luis Rafael Sánchez, full of rhythms found between spaces permeated by the “guagua aérea” [the Airbus], a symbol of migratory status that proclaims borderlessness and intercultural fluidity: “it does not abandon Puerto Rican ethnicity but acknowledges its dynamism, its ability to evolve and incorporate and, most of all, to survive” (Kanellos 2003, 43). In order to meet such a challenge it is imperative to sidestep traditional binary translation models, which are clearly restrictive when defining a rich intercultural and in-between territory, “Encancaranublado,” as characterized by Ana Lydia Vega, “aguantando,” in the words of Junot Díaz. It is a territory that thrives on cross-pollination and rejects essentialist, hegemonic and hierarchical points of view. When dealing with the translation of these authors, “a translator does not deny the contradictions between the worlds but rather uses them productively […] These authors value a writerly, active, resistant translation more than readerly, passive, or literal translation […] something new is created […] a mode of language that can no longer be viewed as a source or a target but must be viewed as both, simultaneously” (Cutter 2005:8, 14, 15). And some authors create new challenges for translators not only by using hybrid words, but also by mixing English and Spanish syntactic structures to create a language that is not “correct” either in Standard English or Standard Spanish (for instance, Julia Alvarez in In the Time of the Butterflies); they include literal translations of proverbs (as in How the García Girls Lost Their Accents); or they employ literal translations of Spanish sentences in English, something that Sandra Cisneros does when she writes “Late or early,” and in “Los Acknowledgements” that precede Women Hollering Creek, or uses phrases such as “at the next full moon, I gave light (Cisneros 1991:93). Emotions may appear to be in English, yet the underlying structure is clearly that of the language of the heart: “My sky, my life, my eyes,” “my heaven” or “my soul” (ibid.: 113, 136, 154). These are illustrative examples of a deterritorialization of the English language that call for translation strategies that escape monolingualism, which is perceived as a political repression in circumstances where the coexistence of various linguistic systems may become a threat (Derrida 1982/1985:100). It could be said that there has been a significant improvement when dealing with these types of translations. While in the past one might find the systematic use of Castilian Spanish in translations (a strategy that reflects the old colonial power at hand as well as the economic interests of the publishing house, whose main concern is whether the translation will be easier to sell in Spain if it is easier to “understand”), nowadays the ethical implications of translation are more frequently taken into account. In this regard, it is interesting to point out the translation into Catalan of several of Sandra Cisneros’ works undertaken by Pilar Godayol, Nuria Brufau’s translation of Graciela Limón’s Los recuerdos de Ana Calderón, or the first translation of Gustavo Pérez Firmat’s (2017) narrative by Aparicio and Esteban. In these cases, intellectual and academic criteria supersede economic interests, and all kinds of voices and music can be heard (Pratt 2002: 33). In this and other examples, translations can, most certainly, be as good as the original (Stavans 2001). It is also important to underscore the fact that some of the one-and-a-halfers are also translators. Worthy of mention here is Pérez Firmat’s intralinguistic and transcultural rewriting of T.S. Eliot’s “The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock” in Dirty Old Man or Stavans’s translations of Don Quijote, Hamlet and, more recently, Little Príncipe into Spanglish. Stavans’ translations are more than mere translations; they are a political stance against Standard American and Standard Spanish, and they raise an interesting question: what does the switch from one language to another really entail? (Stavans 2001). These translations highlight the fact that “abrogation and appropriation of the colonial languages is an overt political act of defiance” (Ashcroft et al. 2002: 37–38). They counteract a monochromatic and monolingual point of view currently being enforced by authoritarian governments. They negate uniqueness by using mixture, hybridization, the atravesado, the hyphen, la rajadura, a multicolored century, because De colores means all of us (Martínez 1998). These and other translations advocate for 1.5, for an ever-changing translation (Stavans in Sokol 2004:87), “relevant” (Derrida 2001), contrapuntual (Said 1993: 366), based on hospitality and not “hostipitality (Derrida 2000, 2005; Ricoeur 2004/2006), nor on monolingualism (Derrida 1998), or “verbal hygiene” (Cameron 1995). They are not “molar,” but molecular translations (Deleuze and Guattari 1980), because they are not interested in territoriality, but rather in representation through fluxes, connections and disjunctions that lead to deterritorialization along with reterritorialization; this results in the transformation of “major” languages into “minor” languages (Deleuze and Guattari 1975). Although such translations embody the hardship of the hyphen (Pérez Firmat 1994), “For us, the hyphen is not a minus sign but a plus, a sign of life, a vital sign. For us hyphenation is oxygenation, a breath of fresh air into a dusty and musty casa[…] Only by becoming double, can he ever be whole; only by being two, will he ever be someone” (Pérez Firmat 1987: 7; see also Pérez Firmat 1994). That is why he describes himself in an (un)transtable sentence: “[…] pero así soy: yo y you y tú y two” (Pérez Firmat 1995:197). This is not translation but desdoblamiento (Pratt 2010:96). Here, “translation is as important a creative endeavor as the one the author embarks on himself […] Every translation, the art of betrayal embedded in it, is problematic. So, to be dissatisfied with a translation is an average reaction. frequently taken into account. In this regard, it is interesting to point out the translation into Catalan of several of Sandra Cisneros’ works undertaken by Pilar Godayol, Nuria Brufau’s translation of Graciela Limón’s Los recuerdos de Ana Calderón, or the first translation of Gustavo Pérez Firmat’s (2017) narrative by Aparicio and Esteban. In these cases, intellectual and academic criteria supersede economic interests, and all kinds of voices and music can be heard (Pratt 2002: 33). In this and other examples, translations can, most certainly, be as good as the original (Stavans 2001). It is also important to underscore the fact that some of the one-and-a-halfers are also translators. Worthy of mention here is Pérez Firmat’s intralinguistic and transcultural rewriting of T.S. Eliot’s “The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock” in Dirty Old Man or Stavans’s translations of Don Quijote, Hamlet and, more recently, Little Príncipe into Spanglish. Stavans’ translations are more than mere translations; they are a political stance against Standard American and Standard Spanish, and they raise an interesting question: what does the switch from one language to another really entail? (Stavans 2001). **These translations highlight the fact that “abrogation and appropriation of the colonial languages is an overt political act of defiance”** (Ashcroft et al. 2002: 37–38). **They counteract a monochromatic and monolingual point of view currently being enforced by authoritarian governments.** They negate uniqueness by using mixture, hybridization, the atravesado, the hyphen, la rajadura, a multicolored century, because De colores means all of us (Martínez 1998). These and other translations advocate for 1.5, for an ever-changing translation (Stavans in Sokol 2004:87), “relevant” (Derrida 2001), contrapuntual (Said 1993: 366), based on hospitality and not “hostipitality (Derrida 2000, 2005; Ricoeur 2004/2006), nor on monolingualism (Derrida 1998), or “verbal hygiene” (Cameron 1995). They are not “molar,” but molecular translations (Deleuze and Guattari 1980), because they are not interested in territoriality, but rather in representation through fluxes, connections and disjunctions that lead to deterritorialization along with reterritorialization; this results in the transformation of “major” languages into “minor” languages (Deleuze and Guattari 1975). Although such translations embody the hardship of the hyphen (Pérez Firmat 1994). But dissatisfaction makes room for curiosity. In other words, I believe that while translation is an ill-fated endeavor, we are all improved by it” (Stavans in Sokol 2004:81). The analysis of the mestizo language used by the one-and-a-halfers and of some of the different translations of their works bring attention to the complex interface between the global and the local, as well as between languages themselves. Against English and Spanish as part of the gradual homogenization of the world, these hybrid writers locate “english” and “spanish” within a complex vision of globalization that seeks to understand the role of dominant languages both critically – in terms of new forms of power, control and destruction – and in its complexity – in terms of new forms of resistance, change, appropriation and identity (Pennycook 2007: 5). **The atravesados use language(s) as a way to construct translingual identities. They are postmonolingual writers who live “beyond the concept of the mother tongue”** (Yildiz 2012:14). Their particular use of language brings to light a fundamental problem of otherness and highlights the tension within the dominant response of power when denying or combating hybridity, multiplicity, mixing, crossing and related expressions of impurity. Thus, the one-and-a-halfers move the debate into the political field, since their dangerous multilingualism deconstructs the Global North’s perspectives on order, purity and normality (Blommaert et al. 2012). These texts emerge from language contact in everyday life. This is not a new phenomenon, but recent forms of globalization have given greater visibility to such forms of communication. With globalization, the world has not become a village “but rather a tremendously complex web of villages, towns, neighbourhoods, settlements connected by material and symbolic ties in often unpredictable ways” (Blommaert 2010:1). This is a positive effect of globalization since it forces us to unthink and rethink trans-contextual networks, flows and movements. Transnational contact in diverse cultural and social domains have increased the interaction between languages and language groups and migration has involved people taking their heritage languages to new locales that were not traditionally part of their communities (Canagarajah 2013: 2). These are cross-cultural writings where source and target language come into contact not only during the process of writing but also “in the story-world.” In these cases, translation is not only the medium but also the object of representation. Therefore, linguistic hybridity contributes to the construction of the author’s world view both directly insofar as it is a manifestation of his/her attitude toward the languages involved and in a more subtle manner as it contributes to the construction of the narrator’s and the characters’ world view (Klinger 2015:1). This may explain Stavans’s comments in his essay “We Are the Clarion: An Immigrant Manifesto,” the centerpiece of an exhibition called My America: Immigrant & Refugee Writers Today, at The American Writers Museum in Chicago: There is no America without outsiders. Call us pilgrims, slaves, refugees, exiles, immigrants, even tourists – we all, directly or indirectly, come from somewhere else. As a nation, the glue tying us together is the shared sense of destiny we nurture and the conviction that somehow this place is different, unlike any other, even exceptional, and that here we may finally breath free. We trade in reinvention. What we were is not who we are and who we will be. It starts with our language […] English is the nation’s dominant language but thanks to immigrants, all other languages (Chinese, Swahili, Bengali, Arabic, Italian, Gaelic… even Latin) are here too, through nostalgia and as an effort to trace our roots […] Immigrants are the thermometer that announces the health of a language. The moment we become proficient in English in America, we feel we belong. Yet, our proficiency is stagnant. Willingly or otherwise, we keep a transaction with our original tongues. Look at how American immigrant writers are restless, innovative, pioneering: O.E. Rølvaag, Isaac Bashevis Singer, Vladimir Nabokov, Felipe Alfau, Lucette Lagnado, Jamaica Kincaid, Jhumpa Lahiri, and Edwidge Danticat. They turn English upside down and inside out; they also season it with their original spices into a gorgeous polyglot stew […]. We immigrant writers have something to prove; that something is that America is an unfinished project. In this context, translation assumes a politically, socially and culturally oriented approach, since it is understood as a procedure touching upon issues of race, class, gender, minority status, ideology, ethics, giving them a central place in analyses of translational phenomena (House 2016: 7). Thus, “these hybrid authors bring forward new questions and approaches in the field of translation studies” (Levine 2018:9). These writers live in translation, a situation that allows them “to resist reduction and conversion into definitive meanings and authoritative intentions” (Rafael 2016:14). In their writings, “abrogation and appropriation” (Ashcroft et al. 2002: 37–38) of the colonial languages (English and Spanish) is an overt political act of defiance, and translation may become a weapon against American imperial ideology (Rafael 2012). The hybrid language of the one-and-a-halfers is a great challenge for translators, since in their case, perhaps more than ever, translation may betray their ideological context or, on the contrary, dwell on/in difference.

#### The Kentucky Round Robin is not the place to regurgitate the same solipsistic framework shell but sets the standard for new knowledge production to connect the “game” to academic and political institutions

Reid-Brinkley 12 (Interview with Dr. Shanara Reid-Brinkley conducted by Scott Odekirk on 2/13/2012 at the University of Texas debate tournament. Shanara is the first black woman director of debate in the country, a professor of communications at Pitt, and a general goddess of knowledge. The Doctor Shanara Reid Brinkley Interview. <https://puttingthekindebate.wordpress.com/2012/04/02/the-dr-shanara-reid-brinkley/> //shree. DOA: 3-14-18. The phrase [democracy assistance] is replaced with [legal immigration] in brackets to reflect this year’s resolution.)

Odekirk: What do you think, if you had an idea, if you had one wish of what you could do with scholarship in debate rounds that could come to terms with these kind of like structural, the creation of scapegoats, the ostracization of structures, the symbolization of power, the reinforcement of power through different structural things. What can we do with our scholarship, or is there anything, maybe there’s not. What can we do in terms of our debating, to come to terms with this [ed]? Dr. Reid-Brinkley: Well, step one is do some [ed] research. If your answers to Wilderson’s afro-pessimism argument is a Wilderson indict from somebodies book review, and that’s all you got to say to Wilderson you’re an [ed] idiot. You’re an idiot. You are an idiot. And so I’m astounded looking at debate coaches who I know who do nothing but cut cards who are refusing to do research! What the!? Where are we? I thought we were good at debate. I thought we are in debate. I thought we did research, I thought that’s what sort of defined our community. So you’re telling me you can’t go find the afro-optimists who answer the afro-pessimists? It astounds me. I don’t get it. So I think step one is; shut up about complaining about framework and do some [ed] research. There is black literature being produced every moment of every day. There is a whole area of the library, sections of the stacks, with relevant information that might be useful for you. Go read some African American history, go find the little out about Africa and Chattel Slavery and the slave trade. It is so simple to me that I don’t understand why the debate community is refusing to do research. Odekirk: Yeah, fair. Dr. Reid-Brinkley: So how about we just start there? Step 1: do some research. Odekirk: Yeah. Dr. Reid-Binkley: Now here is the fear. If that was the only answer, the debate community would do research, but it would be just to cut cards and nothing really would change. So it can’t stop at research, but that is literally step one: go do some reading. That would really help you have a language and a vocabulary for talking when you are engaging these teams that will produce very good debates. So when people say that they don’t think that what performance/movement teams are doing is intellectual, it’s because they have already decided that they are anti-intellectual. Whereas they are very much so intellectuals, as a matter of fact they are few of the debaters in our community producing scholarship rather than regurgitating it. Our very frame of reference on how to engage in debate is about the regurgitation of information, rather than the production of it. That is where I think we have gone wrong, which is also why we are not having good – we are not able to advertise to our administrations in a way that makes debate something that administrations really really want to support and fully fund. And the reason is because we made it such this isolated solipsistic game that people who are really interested in knowledge production don’t necessarily see their relationship to it. We are losing tenure stream jobs for debate directors in our community. The reason is because our community is becoming more and more disconnected from the academy. What we can do in terms of how we produce scholarship for debate, in debate rounds, is that we need to change our focus from the regurgitation of information that is already produced in the academy to an engagement with it so that we are producing new knowledge. So rather than saying the only way you can have a plan for what to do different with democracy assistance is to find what the USFG has already defined it as, and get authors who, you have to find a solvency advocate for whatever change you are going to make. So somebody has already produced that idea and gotten it into print. Stupid! Stupid. We are so smart, this community of people, I have never been around smarter people than the people in the debate community. That’s why I find it exciting. Because I’m really smart, so I enjoy talking to other smart people. And, we are just not making use of the intelligence, the intellectual power that is at a debate tournament, especially when you get to the top of the game, it is amazingly powerful. I have met graduate students and professors that are nowhere near as smart as some of our undergraduates their senior year at the height of their ability to compete. Just have not. Odekirk: Amen. Dr. Reid-Brinkley: Given that this is the case, why are we not producing knew knowledge? Rather than coming at a plan as I have to have a solvency advocate who has already defined this, and I have to define this in the context of exactly how the USFG has previously defined it. I think we should be producing new arguments about what democracy assistance [legal immigration] should look like and be like through the USFG. So rather than having a solvency advocate you would have evidentiary support to change parts of your argument. Just like writing an academic paper. If all academic papers were was regurgitation of someone else’s argument, it would never get published. The whole point of academic scholarship is for you to identify what’s being said in the field or around a particular issue and what’s missing from that, and then you do something to demonstrate why that thing that’s missing in that scholarship should be there, and you make an argument about how we need to expand our understanding of this situation. Does that make sense to you? So it doesn’t make sense that the ways we in which we engage in policy making is to simply chain it out to what something else someone has already thought of. When we have all this intellectual power, we should be producing new policy. That would be the change. That would change our very way of thinking about what the game is that we are playing, and what its potential connection is to both the academy but also politics. And that would create the space for teams who want to talk about anti-blackness or teams that want to talk about the defining nature of gender and how we engage in policy. It would allow all these different things because our very frame of reference for understanding what the game is that we are engaging in would change, it would open up fields of literature, it would make sense that people are saying we need a three tier methodology where we look at organic intellectuals we look at other scholars and we look at our personal experience, guess what, that’s how you write a [ed] academic paper now. Odekirk: Strong. Dr. Reid-Brinkley: How about you just get with the program? Odekirk: Its so obvious, but I’ve never seen it. You are so right, but I’m having a major ‘a-ha moment’ right now, to be honest. You are so [ed] right. Its also so been there my whole life, but I have literally never thought that, and.. duh. Dr. Reid-Brinkley: Yeah, that’s how I feel about it, like duh! Know what I mean? Then we have a much better argument to make to our administrations about the significance of our programs, we can start connecting debate tournament final rounds to what’s going on in public policy research institutions. What we produce could literally provide an entrance for our arguments to actually affect public policy because of the intellectual power our community holds. Why are we not making use of the things that would get our programs support? It doesn’t make sense to me. That’s why debate is collapsing to this very small small small society. Once that collapse between the NDT and CEDA happened, have you watched the community shrink over time? It just has gotten smaller. And it will continue to get smaller, because we will continue to disconnect ourselves from the academy. But why are we not in conversations on a consistent basis with our authors? Duh!? This is why whats happening in black debate. Is more fascinating than what is happening anywhere else. I’m really interested in Spurlock interviewing Spanos about debate. Im interested in the fact that Damiyr & Miguel, members of the Towson squad, me and some other black debate people got invited by Dylan Rodriguez to appear at the American Studies Conference to talk about what’s happening in debate and activism and scholarship around blackness in issues like prison, etc. I’m interested in that, because these scholars are like ‘woah, yall are talking about this stuff here?’ and they are like watching video links of the students debating, and like they’re on our Resistance homepage. I have created a Facebook Resistance page that’s private that all of the movement and its coalition members are on. So, I get requests, I put you on if you are a coalition member, Wilderson is on there, Dylan Rodriguez is on there, Sexton is on there, you know what I mean? And, we just…that’s what debate should look like. Academics should be participating, they shouldn’t control it, but you should be able to come talk to us in our theories about the topic. How about that? You don’t need to write evidence for you about the Arab Spring for me to describe to you why my work on African American culture and hip hop are relevant to thinking about what’s going on in the Arab Spring. I simply am teaching you to chain my theory through another example. That’s how you write an academic paper. You take somebody else’s theory, and you don’t just map it exactly on to what it is that you are working on. You have to figure out what the relationship is between the two. That’s the kind of stuff we could produce as a community, every year, on topics. We just are not taking advantage of that. And, in that process, because of how we have defined debate, it is exclusionary. We do have these ideal debaters who look like white males, white straight men with money and class, and those white men who don’t fit that, are few and far between. They often get up there, but they still is sort of like a little weird, because you don’t perform white masculinity middle to upper class in an appropriate manner, so they are cool with you, but you’re still freaky. We make those kinds of judgments because we are just so insulated. Our thinking is so small. Smaller than it what we should and could be. And, that’s my debate future. That’s my vision of what it could look like, my dream that lets me walk around at tournaments and be okay with the fact that supposedly I’m despised by the elites, higher-ups in the community, and people that used to be my friends, and that would speak to me on a regular basis and that I would run up to and hug, avoid my eyes in the hallway. Or that I’m not qualified to write about debate, but neither is Spanos because he was an outsider, but I’m not qualified to write about it because I’m an insider. But, Casey Harrigan, and Jarrod Atchison, and Pannetta are…there is no question of their qualifications. I’m sorry, I thought I got a PhD from the number one program in rhetoric in the country. I’m sorry, I thought that was the case. I thought I was a national award winning scholar, for my writing, published writing. I thought that was the case, and that would make me somehow qualified to talk about debate a little bit… but, clearly not. But, once your black. Once you say your black, then your biased.

#### Reformed mestiza consciousness fosters political unity to deconstruct the academy – we should depart from the institutions that hold us hostage.

Torres 90 (Hector A. Torres, Professor at the University of New Mexico, “Mestiza Consciousness and Dialect(ic)s: Gloria Anzaldua’s Borderlands/La Frontera: the New Mestiza,” https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1005&context=engl\_fsp//af)

Evidence that Anzaldua's Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza cannot be a simple species of autobiography but that its composition gives it the flavor of an aphoristic critical philosophy stems from the way mestiza consciouness seizes upon the subject-object dichotomy, a staple of Western philosophy, in order to expose its limitations. In its aim and scope mestiza consciousness expresses a form of dialectics that has a historical link with the Critical Theory of the Frankfurt School. Speaking of the role of dialectics in society, for instance, Herbert Marcuse (1989:276) does not hesitate to assign to dialectical thinking a global scope and a precise aim: "We are dealing," he states, "with the dialectics of liberation ... and not only liberation in an intellectual sense, but liberation involving the mind and the body, liberation involving entire human existence." In the tradition of Critical Theory, Borderlands also aims for the liberation of the human body and consciousness from the grips of repressive ideology. And like Critical Theory, Borderlands also invests heavily in the political force of the the social act of writing. Marcuse 's assessment of the United States educational system is pertinent more t han ever when he states (286): "The educational system is political, so it i s not we who want to politicize the educational system. What we want is a counterpolicy against the established policy." Likewise, Anzaldua's commitment to the social act of writing puts Borderlands at the forefront of current political debates concerning the role of the University in American political life. Synchronically, **the strategy** Anzaldua **adopts to use the language, concepts, codes, and categories of the Academy against itself is in step with the current uses of deconstruction** within the current American Academic critical debates to solicit the logos of Western metaphysics. In both mestiza consciousness and deconstruction there is a double movement, a necessity even, on the one hand to use the metaphysical categories of the Western tradition from a certain outside without being swallowed, doing so without its critical force being neutralized on the other. One major point of difference between mestiza consciousness and deconstruction, and this due to the farmer's status as "minor" theory, is in the choice of critical vocabulary. As many critics of deconstrution have pointed out, deconstruction, despite its c laim to a certain exteriority, works with high canonical texts and with a high canonical critical vocabulary. By contrast, mestiza consciousness asks the minor writer to begin writing in her 'home(ly)' dialect and right where she is. This point of departure takes further the logic of bricolage insofar as the imperative to liberate herself from the grip of a repressive Academic ideology gathers its force from the assumption and proposition that no vocabulary other than her native tongue i s needed to speak about the the politics of her own liberation. Such a dialectical point in the composit ion of Borderlands is equivalent to the sociolinguistic affirmation that dialects, regional, social, or otherwise, are equal in their expressive capacity to the social circumstances from which they emerge. It is on the foothold of this sociolinguistic truism that my reading of Borderlands bases the etymological montage between the terms dialects and dialectics. Furthermore, the sociolinguistic orientation brings into play another distinction that Anzaldua is also fond of making and that parallels the major-minor distinction. In interview, Anzaldua also refers to her mode of theory construction as a "low" variety, a distinction that echoes the distinction made by such sociolinguists as Joshua Fishman and Charles Ferguson. 3 Though the details of the distinction are subtle and not easily summarizable, scholars such as Fishman and Ferguson agree that the High versus Low distinction between language varieties with respect to a specific sociolinguistic context has irreducibly to do with the use of the former for formal discourse situations and the latter with informal interaction. Because Anzaldua's explicit goal in writing theory in the low mode is to loosen the grip that represssive ideology has on the consciousness (and hence the body) of minor writers, she seizes on the political nature of this sociolinguistic phenomenon and uses it to shed light on the politics of theory construction in general. In Making Faces, Making Soul Hacienda Caras (1990), she explicitly states: We need to de-acad academize theory and to connect the community to the academy. 'High ' theory does not translate well when one's intention is to communicate to masses of people made up of different audiences. We need to give up the notion that there is a ' correct' way to write theory. (xxvi) 4 From the standpoint of such a communicative goal, the linguistic codes Anzaldua's employs to write Borderlands stretch to bridge the "diglossic" split between low and high theory. Chapter five of Borderlands, "How to Tame a Wild tongue", a discourse on the linguistic contact between English and Spanish in the United States borderlands, takes explicit aim at this diglossic split. The choice to write in a low dialect, from the moment she presses pen to paper, contests the general state of affairs she summarizes with t he bold predication (54): "Language is a male discourse." The straightforward declarative sentence solicits the Western logos at a pervasive site in its historical unfolding: the use of masculine pronouns to refer to both male and female. As the linguistic history of both English and Spanish (along with the other members of the Inda-European family of languages in general) records, the male pronoun is the unmarked way for referring to both males and females, even if in a plurality there is only one male. Anzaldua pinpoints this mode of reference to mark the erasure of female identity in English and Spanish as metonym for the erasure of a Chicano/a presence from American history in general. 5 By seizing the metonymic parallel of part to whole --Chicanas are to language what Chicanos/as are to United States history-- Anzaldua employs mestiza consciousness to expose the limits of the logic of identity. In mestiza style, she affirms a mode of identity that is secure on neither side of the United States-Mexico borderlands (63): "We are a synergy of two cultures with various degrees of Mexicanness or Angloness" she affirms. And precisely at the point at which she and the Chicana/a borderlands would disappear, and by implication, the logic of identity as a whol e, she reasserts: "I have so internalized the borderland conflict that sometimes I feel like one cancels out the other and we are zero, nothing, no one. A veces no soy nada ni nadie, Pero hasta cuando no lo soy, lo soy. " There is a permanence that must be attributed to the Chicana borderlands as long as English and Spanish define a sociopolitical zone of contact in the United States. The historical essentialisms that guarantee the survival of the Chicana borderlands and perforce appear in Anzaldua's Borderlands are emblematically insc ribed in the stylistic code- switch to Spanish. There is no denying that c e rtain e ssentialisms indeed accompany the composition of Borderlands. But it is equally true that the mestiz a s t yle Anzaldua employs to encode them works in tandem with her mestiza consciousness to give a non-simple view of their identity, a view that cannot remain within the law of noncontr adiction. Throughout the unfolding of "How to Tame a Wild Tongue", Anzaldua puts mestiza consciousness and style to work alongside each other in order to bridge her critical vision of life with her experience of living in the borderlands. Her descriptions of Chicana ways of speaking and writing are particularly interesting because they presuppose that one does not have to be an expert in sociolinguistics to address issues of language and identity. The descriptions and presupposition together challenge the Western prescriptivist authorities that would denigrate Chicana ways of speaking and writing through their institutional disposition to reify Western languages rather than submitting them to historical process . In mestiza style, Anzaldua provides a remarkably concise and accurate picture of the English-Spanish linguistic contact zone in the Valley of South Texas. In fact, I do not think it overstates the case to say that the account of linguistic attitudes toward Chicana ways of speaking are largely descriptively adequate and as such strategically generalizable to other regions of the United States where English and Spanish are in contact . Thus, the anecdote with which she opens this chapter, in which she finds herself in a dentist's chair, turns a metaphor for the general diglossia between English and Spanish in the United States. In the figure Anzaldua turns, the dent ist fill s the role of Anglo English as the superposed, High variety, while Anzaldua's tongue, getting in the way of the dentist's instruments and tasks, represents Spanish, the low variety in the Unitd States . Anzaldua straightaway makes clear why t he linguistic codes of Chicanas is the low variety in the United States borderlands, doing so in the code-switching speech of her mother: I want you to speak English. Pa' hallar buen trabajo tienes que sabe r hablar e l ingles bien, Que vale toda tu educaci6n si t odavia hablas ingles con un 'accent'" mot her would say, mortified that I spoke English like a Mexican. (italics in original, 53, 54) What this passage accentuates is the extent to which Chicana English and Spanish are stigimatized varieties of l anguage in the borderlands specifically because of their intonational patterns . Encapsulated in Anzaldua ' s mother ' s exhortation to speak English without an accent is the recognition not only that Anglo Engli sh in its standard variety is the language of economic advancement in the United States, but also that the intonational patterns of Spanish-accented English are somehow unaesthetic to the ear. How many of us h ave changed our accent precisely for these reasons? And what is it about the locutionary streams of sound that Chicanos and Chicanas produce that make these ways of speaking so aesthetical ly unpleasant? As Fernando Penalosa (1985) has established, the politics of Spanish-accented English are much too severe to ignore, because, like the little girl's entry into the symbolic sphere of language always i mplies an erasure, the entry into the American school system of Chicana and Chi cano children with Spanish-accented English into the American school system also implies an equivalent erasure. Penalosa's sociolinguistic work makes it no secret that Spanish-accented English is more often than not perceived by teachers as a lack of intelli gence. Given the tenacity with which these perceptions of accent cling to the Chicana, it is not surprising that Anzaldua focuses on the politics of dialect perception and punctuates her vision with the stark point (54): "Wild tongues can ' t be tamed, they can only be cut out. " ( 54) Such an assert ion serves as reminder Western prescriptivism of a discursive point the science of linguistics views as commonplace--namely that the legislation of one language over another is likely to engender more political division than unity . In this respect, Anzaldua's attitudes toward l anguage seem more in tune with those of sociolinguistics, which as a discipline assumes that linguistic change is the unmarked situation for the world ' s languages and for that reason takes a more laissez-faire attitude toward language change and variation.
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