# Contention 1 - Genealogy

**There is a war going on! Venezuela is the center of the resistance. The movement, which is spreading through Latin America, has provided the necessary revolutionary rebuke to the United States multinational power grab and violent destruction of Latin American populations**

Chris **Carlson 7**, (State of Nature Spring 2007 “Venezuela in the Center of the World”- <http://www.stateofnature.org/?p=6131>)

Maybe you haven’t noticed, but there is a world war going on out there. It’s a class war, raging world-wide, and everyone is affected by it. Across the globe the dividing line has been drawn. A small minority seeks to dominate the world, spreading global free-market capitalism to the last corners of the planet, regardless of the consequences for the people who happen to live there. All alternatives have failed, they tell us. Communism, Socialism, Keynesianism, Protectionism; they have all been tried, none of them worked. Global capitalism is the only way, the only road. There are no alternatives. We have reached the end of history, they say. But suddenly, there is one small problem; Latin America has exploded in protest. The general population of Central and South America have been some of the hardest hit by the new wave of globalization. The region has extreme inequality, where a small upper class lives a life of affluence and comfort, walled-off from the brutal reality of their countries. The majority are the victims who are hard-hit by the policies promoted by this minority elite. The growing mass of slum-dwellers scratches out a living off a dollar or two a day. The wages are so low that the workers are forced to accept horrific living conditions. The picture is a grim one, but this is not only happening in Latin America. It’s happening world-wide. Even in the United States, where the living conditions are much better, the same general process is occurring. The globalization of the economy means that the society is slowly divided into the same two groups; an affluent minority connected to the global economy, and the majority who works in the service sector with a slow but continued decline in living standards. [1]In the United States declining living standards means lower wages, longer hours, and decreasing social mobility for the majority middle class. More fall into poverty every day and the number without access to healthcare grows by the thousands. [2]But in Latin America, declining living standards means tragedy. The malnourished masses flood into overcrowded cities. Urban shanty-towns grow uncontrollably causing infrastructural disasters. As displaced families try to survive on the margins they become more and more desperate. Child labor, drugs, crime, and violence plague the masses. Huge portions of the population are not even afforded basic services such as running water, housing, or plumbing, much less access to education or healthcare. The social and cultural consequences are so grave they are beyond comprehension, and will still be felt many, many years into the future.¶ In the last few years places like Bolivia, Mexico, and Argentina have erupted in massive mobilizations against this new world order. But one nation has led, and continues to lead the battle against this dark trend. One nation is at the center of the global struggle, this world-wide class war. In the last few years, **Venezuela has emerged as the most important battleground of the ongoing war**. The social and political movement in Venezuela insists that another world is possible, that a better system than global capitalism can be built, and it is determined to fight for it. The conflict in Venezuela and now spreading to the rest of Latin America **is the central battlefield in the world war between the multinational ruling class, and the rest of us**. Venezuela: The Eye of the Storm Here’s how it happened. For most of their histories, Latin American nations have been ruled by elite groups. Until the 1970s these groups were both national and internationally connected elites. Governments were, for the most part, a consensus of elite groups, using state resources to increase national production, but without stepping on the interests of the international elites. The masses were kept complacent with populist programs in which the state provided social spending on basic services, subsidized consumption, and government programs. Although the governments by no means represented the interests of the general population, they maintained relative support through these populist programs, and some limited response to popular demands. This is the liberal democratic model. Those who govern are various sectors of the elite class, elected every few years by national elections, but not representative of the popular will. The majority of the population plays no role, being only a spectator except for casting a vote once every 4 or 5 years. This is the system that rules in the United States and has been promoted around the world as “democracy.” A similar system ruled in Venezuela for 4 decades until it fell apart in the nineties. Two parties, both representing elite interests, governed the country together, sharing power between them. [3]As multinational capital grew and expanded around the world, it began to take control not only of first-world countries, but also third-world nations. By the 1980s, national elites had mostly lost dominance, and had joined up to the newly dominant internationally-linked elite groups. A process of neoliberal economic transformation began that totally dismantled the previous state structure. Social spending was mostly eliminated, national industries would no longer be subsidized or protected, populations were left to fend for themselves. This was known as the “Washington Consensus.”The national economies were increasingly opened up to international capital. As national elite groups either joined up with multinational capital or were swallowed by them, the world was divided into two groups; the multinational interests versus the rest of the population. There was now no representation of popular demands in the government, and two basic groups remained. The conflict became a global class war of a tiny minority of wealthy capitalists against virtually everyone else. But instead of quietly standing by, these populations erupted in total rejection of the neoliberal agenda of the multinationals. Venezuela exploded on February 27, 1989. It was the first, the largest and the most violent of the popular explosions that would occur in countries across the region over the next decade. As the international elite consolidated their control over the Venezuela state, they began to dismantle the populist structure. Prices of food, gas, transportation and other essentials immediately shot up as government subsidies were slashed. The budget was put at the service of the international lending institutions. The debt would be paid, but the population would have to go hungry. The masses poured into the streets, rioting, looting, and burning the city. The national army was called out to massacre them by the hundreds. [4]Finding difficulty in expanding in the developed world, corporations now seek to expand across the globe, buying up whole nations. In Venezuela, one of the world’s largest oil producers, international capital sought to privatize the state-controlled oil industry. Throughout the 1990s the plan was to privatize everything from Venezuela’s national resources to telecommunications, health care, and electrical infrastructure among others. By 1998 they had almost completed the job. [5]But the popular movement that began with the violent uprising in 1989 brought President Hugo Chávez to power exactly ten years later. On a platform of total rejection of neoliberal reforms, and defense of the poor majority, Chávez easily swept into power in 1998. Far from being a dictator as has been the claim, Chávez put himself up for reelection just two years later under a new constitution that his government had pioneered. Chávez and the new constitution were widely approved in nation-wide elections. In the conflict between international capital, and the people, Venezuela now had a government that represented the people. Washington and the corporations that they serve became worried. This was exactly the kind of democratic explosion that they had worked so hard to prevent all these years. The last time the Venezuelan people had united behind a popular leader was in 1948, and he only lasted 10 months. Chávez wouldn’t last much longer if Washington and the Venezuelan elite could help it. In 2002, after Chávez had passed new laws calling for agrarian reform and reversing the privatization of the oil industry, they would try to get rid of the popular president once and for all. The high military command renounced the authority of the president and threatened to bomb the presidential palace if he didn’t step down. Chávez was taken into their custody and flown to a small island in the Caribbean. There, according to some witnesses, a U.S. government plane was seen arriving. The plan was to fly Chávez to Cuba where he would be exiled. [6] This was the same strategy later used in 2004 to get rid of popular Haitian president Jean-Bertrand Aristide. Kidnapped by the U.S. army and forced onto military aircraft, Aristide was dumped in Africa and remains there to this day. [7]But the plan failed in Venezuela. Massive protests and the rebellion of the National Guard brought Chávez back to power less than 48 hours later. This wouldn’t be the last attempt, however. The wealthy elite and their ally Washington would continue to work for the removal of the democratic president. [8] With each attempt over the next few years, the Venezuelan masses would become more and more radicalized. Chávez’ political movement would become more and more revolutionary in response. The class conflict had become clearer than ever. Chávez and the Venezuelan masses were now very conscious of who the enemy was. Like no other nation in the world, in Venezuela any elected official can be revoked at mid term, a policy pioneered by Chávez under the new constitution. In 2004, a Washington-funded NGO in Caracas led a campaign to use his own policy against him and recall Chávez’ presidential term. Once again, the US was working on getting rid of the popular leader. After collecting enough signatures, the recall referendum went to a national vote. Chávez easily won the referendum, and his mandate was again approved before public opinion. [9]In December of 2006, in nation-wide presidential elections, Chávez received twice as many votes as any president in Venezuela’s history. He won the support of 63% of the population for another six-year term. [10] It can now be said that Hugo Chávez is the most popular Venezuelan president ever.And the achievements are significant. Hundreds of health clinics have been built around the country, dozens of new high-tech hospitals, new universities, educational programs, subsidized food markets, to name a few. Literacy programs have officially eradicated illiteracy in the country. Thousands of Cuban doctors have been spread throughout the country, building a new health system based on the Cuban system. [11]Although critics have said that this model cannot work, that Chávez is taking the wrong road, in Venezuela they have demonstrated that there are alternatives to free-market neoliberalism. With consistently high growth rates over the last few years, Venezuela now has one of the fastest growing economies in the world. And with growth in non-petroleum sectors leading the way, along with integration with their neighbors, Venezuela is on its way to freeing itself from dependence on oil exports. [12]According to a recent survey, in recent years the poorest sectors of Venezuelan society have drastically increased their spending. [13] The minimum wage has been repeatedly raised, and is now higher than it has ever been. Venezuela’s wealth is now being redistributed more equally. The country’s resources have been maximized for the benefit of the people, not the multinational corporations.But perhaps most importantly, this movement is not just about improving the conditions of the majority poor. It is about building an alternative system, a popular democracy to challenge the liberal elite democracy of before. They are experimenting with transforming the economy, and political structure of the country. Cooperatives are being promoted by the government around the country. New community councils are being given more power to govern over their own affairs. Millions of poor Venezuelans who never had the legal documents to vote, to participate, have been given an identity by this government, and have been given the right to participate. [14]Unlike any time in Venezuela’s history, the masses are permitted and encouraged to participate, to make decisions. Venezuela is challenging the Washington consensus that gives all the power to multinational corporations. They are experimenting with giving the power to the people. [15] In a world where multinational capital reigns, Venezuela has become the biggest challenge to their domination. And as Chávez’ movement has consolidated power in Venezuela, his influence in the region has also grown. The popular movements against neoliberal globalization are sprouting up across the continent. In Bolivia, Ecuador, and Nicaragua, movements similar to Venezuela’s have taken power and are beginning their own transformations. Nations like Mexico, Colombia and Peru are also seeing significant movements for change that could take power in the near future. Latin America as a whole has become the biggest threat to the neoliberal model, with Venezuela in the lead. The fight is to build a new alternative to global capitalism and liberal elite democracy. In Venezuela the goal is to build a political system that truly lies in the hands of the people, a popular democracy instead of a representative democracy. A democracy where everyone participates in the political system as well as in the economic system. Instead of a capitalist economy which creates huge inequalities and concentration of wealth and power, Venezuela is searching for a new way to organize the economy to allow for a fairer and more egalitarian distribution of wealth. At the very root of some of the biggest problems in the modern world, Venezuela is searching for a solution. For the sake of all of us, let’s hope they can succeed.

**Leftist strategies and development from below are a necessary counterweight to hemispheric politics perpetuated by the North onto the South. There needs to be a complete recalibration of our relationship for there to be cohesion between the United States and Venezuela**

**McLaren, 13** [Peter, Professor at UCLA, Ph.D in Curriculum and Educational Theory, "Education as Liberation: the Bolivarian Alternative Hugo Chavez (1954-2013)," vol. 2, no. 1, Post-Colonial Directions in Education, BJM]

The historical debates surrounding the legacy of Hugo Chavez have begun. Perhaps one day I will join these debates. But not now. Attacks on Chavez ‘the dictator’ or Chavez the charismatic ‘opponent’ of the United States will demand from the left a spirited defense. Perhaps I will join such an effort in the months and years ahead. But not now. In this brief space I want to speak about Hugo Chavez as a leader who inspired a generation to believe that an alternative to capitalism could be fashioned from a reinvention of the state by the popular majorities. The popularity of Chavez had a world-historical reach and it would not be a mistake to analyze his charismatic leadership in the context of a personality cult like that of Fidel, Che, or Subcommandante Marcos, for instance. To do this is not to diminish the importance of his role as a figure that could galvanize millions on the left and animate their faith that a more humane alternative to capitalism was a possibility, once the battle against U.S. imperialism was won. Chavez, whose father was of Indian descent and his mother, of African descent, was often the object of racial derision by the Venezuela’s white ruling elite, who did not hide their racial separateness from the rest of the Venezuelan population, four-fifths of whom could be described as indigenous-mestizo-mullato-African. I remember one day, after a particularly long march down the streets of Caracas supporting President Chavez, I went from store-to-store in an attempt to purchase a popular Chavez doll as a souvenir. But there was not a single doll to be found. I was told that I could find one in Altamira, an affluent east Caracas neighborhood. I was surprised. A fellow camarada laughed at my expression and told me that the white ruling elite--often referred to as “esqualidos” (a colloquialism for squalid people)--had plenty of Chavez dolls available in their upscale stores. Referring to Chavez as “ese mono” (that monkey), they would tie the dolls to the bumpers of their cars and drag them through the streets. The contrast between the cold and dispassionate statement released by the Obama administration after the death of President Chavez and spirited praise of Chavez by the fourteen Latin American countries that decreed official days of mourning for him could not have been more stark. Shattering the din created by the heartfelt outpourings of grief, respect and admiration from Latin American heads of state for this towering figure on the world stage who sported a trademark red beret, was the stony silence of the White House statement that offered no condolences, a fact that revealed the United States was the real corpse at Chavez’s funeral, and the spirit of the corpse that everyone was mourning was very much alive and sizzling in the afternoon air, like a freshly cooked arepa that Chavez loved so much. The fact that Chavez was so vocal about condemning the role of the Colossus of the North (a phrase used by artist Diego Rivera to describe the United States) and American-style capitalist imperialism did not mean that many other Latin American presidents didn’t sympathize with his views. But they did not want to appear on the certified list of enemies of the United States. Chavez was the most courageous of them all, and allowed himself to serve as a lightning rod for anti-imperialism in Las Americas and a harbinger for the "second independence" of South America. That is not to say that Nestor and Cristina Kirchner in Argentina, Lula da Silva and then Dilma Rousseff in Brazil, Evo Morales in Bolivia, Daniel Ortega in Nicaragua, Fernando Lugo in Paraguay, Jose "Pepe" Mujica in Uruguay and Mauricio Funes in El Salvador were not oftentimes courageous and valiant in their stance against U.S. imperialism. But it was Chavez that carried the banner. As Marc Weisbrot and others have noted, these leaders were well aware that all of Latin America benefitted from the leadership of Hugo Chavez, where the poverty rate fell in Latin America from 42 percent at the beginning of the decade to 27 percent by 2009. But no leader had as much charisma, nor control over such vast oil reserves, as Hugo Chavez. A military man, Chavez was better positioned than most to be aware of the devastating destruction the U.S. wreaked on populations in Latin America by its military support of the death squads in, El Salvador, Chile, Brazil, Nicaragua, not to mention more distant locations such as Korea, Vietnam, Laos, Grenada, Iraq, and where radioactive contamination from depleted uranium shells is still wreaking havoc on the unborn as well as the living. –through his efforts at the formation of UNASUR (the Union of South American Nations), CELAC (the Community of Latin American and Caribbean Nations) and ALBA (the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America), the latter of which aspired to set up a multi-polar global system embedded in international relations more adequate for the needs and potentials of developing countries. Insinuating itself into our daily life as an ideology as much as a set of accumulation practices and processes of production, neoliberal capitalism pretends to the throne of democracy-building but in reality it has hastened its demise. Capitalism wears a coquettish and self-effacing sheen of timelessness, inviolate consistency, and seamless immutability, but that sheen is not any more permanent than the lipstick on a mirror, or than the Barry Manilow hits played on vibraphone wafting through the shopping malls, or than one of Charles Bukowski’s famous beer farts. What makes capitalism seem indelible yet imitable is the fact that it makes certain people very rich, and these paragons of the capitalist class are those that the state media apparatuses parade in its garish media outlets—the movie stars, the corporate moguls, the trend-setters, the celebrities and the culture brokers. While news of celebrity cellulite shakes us awake with amphetamine alertness, we are provided by Hollywood gossip barons, equipped with the most profound and galvanizing lucidity available on which star has the best bikini body. At the same time, we remain emotionally drowsy to the pain and suffering of people who struggle and strain against falling household wealth, unemployment and lack of food and medical care. And we rarely cast our eyes south of the border. Hugo Chavez raised the stakes for North Americans. He showed us that a President could be democratically elected many times and still direct the majority of his efforts at helping the poor and disenfranchised help themselves. He made us aware that the comfort we enjoyed in the United States was a direct result of the enforced dependency that the US created with Las Americas. He showed the world that the class struggle is no longer demarcated by men in boiler suits or railhead pants versus factory owners in top hats, continental cross ties and double-breasted vests. Or the sans-culottes versus the breech-garbed ruling class. Or financiers with capes and silver-tipped canes exploiting the labor power of frutiers, cobblers and copper miners lugging luchpails of lost dreams. The struggle, as he would tell us in his weekly television show, Alo Presidente, is the transnational capitalist class against all those who depend upon wages for their labor. He showed us that we need cultures of contestation that are transnational in scope to end the exploitation of capitalism. Chavez’s Bolivarian Circles (named after Simon Bolivar serve as watchdog groups modeled after Cuba’s Committee for the Defense of the Revolution and function as liaisons between the neighborhoods and the government as well as fomenting support for Chavez) were important in combating business leaders and dissident army generals whom, with U.S. support, were trying to overthrow the Chavez government. Members of the Bolivarian Circles would bang on hollow electricity poles to warn against mobilizations by the opposition and to rally supporters across the city’s working-class neighborhoods. They were an example of self-determination for sovereignty as evidenced by the Bolivarian declaration “Nuestra America: una Sola Patria” (Our America: one motherhood) which rejects an ideological loyalty to “America” as an America defined by a capitalist laden value system that favors imperialism and exploitation for increased profit margins. Chavez created an infrastructure for communal councils and for self-management in factories and cooperatives and for participation in social programs. This was an astonishing accomplishment because never before did the people living in the barrios have a real chance to participate in the government. For a leader to take the position of working from a preferential option of the poor and powerless and to be re-elected more times than any other leader in the western hemisphere (in the same amount of time)--and to survive a U.S.-supported coup in 2002 and oil strikes that crippled the economy--that is quite a feat. Even Jimmy Carter has praised the election process in Venezuela as among the fairest he has observed. Chavez’s policies pointed towards the importance of ‘development from below’ which could be achieved through the democratization of the workplace by way of workers’ councils and a major shift of ownership of production, trade and credit in order to expand food production and basic necessities to the poor who inhabit the ‘internal market.’ Once President Chavez was able to control the oil industry, his government was able to reduce poverty by half and extreme poverty by 70 percent. Public pensions rose from 500,000 to over two million. Chavez helped turn Venezuela from being one of the most unequal countries in Latin America to (after Cuba) being the most equal in terms of income. Capitalism works through a process of exchange-value, whereas Chavez was more interested in the process of communal exchange—that is, to cite but one example, exchanging oil for medical care in a program with Cuba in which Cuban doctors were brought into Venezuela and were set up in various barrios. I remember once I was very ill with a fever off the charts and had to call a doctor, but before the doctor arrived I struggled in vain to pull my Che t-shirt over my drenched body to express a sign of solidarity from this ailing gringo. Chavez followed the principle of “buen vivir” which can be translated as “to live well.” But this term, which has indigenous roots, is very different from the North American term, “the good life.” Buen Vivir requires that individuals in their various communities are in actual possession of their rights and are able to exercise their responsibilities in the context of a respect for diversity and in accordance with the rights of ecosystems. Its about social wealth—not material wealth. I was privileged to be a guest several times on Alo Presidente, once when sitting next to Ernesto Cardinal. I listened to Ernesto wax eloquently about Chavez, and Chavez’s dream of bringing humanity together through a deep spiritual love. I attended meetings of the misiones, social programs in health, education, work and housing, set up by Chavez when he came into office in 1999 to help the poor to become literate, to finish high school, to organize their communities and to get medical attention.

**Where are we in Venezuela? We aren’t from Venezuela; we aren’t part of the groups who stage protests against the opposition. We never met Chávez, and the first time we got in touch with this reality was at the beginning of last summer. However, “We are all Chávez”. We speak of the resistance, we offer our faithful support, and we expose their subjugated knowledge to our community. We have spent hours researching the truth claims made through the Latin American performance, and engaged people in laboriously translating Spanish texts, because it’s nearly impossible to find English versions of Latin American knowledge…and it isn’t hard to guess why. The Department of State recognizes almost every organization that Venezuela is in, but they conveniently leave out ALBA, or the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America. The genealogy offered by the federal government includes the aid we have given to Venezuela, but neglects to note the free oil that Venezuela gave to US citizens in New York. Rather than recognize the reality of a participatory democracy, they refer to the system of government in Venezuela as having an outsized role for the executive, which considering the legislature’s power, is simply untrue. The discussion of US-Mexico bilateral relations from the Department of State doesn’t even mention the Zapatistas, as if they never existed. It also ignores the 1954 Caracas Resolution, an anti-Communist resolution against Guatemala, economic sanctions on Cuba, and interventions in the Dominican Republic, Grenada, Panama, and Haiti, all of which Mexico strongly opposed and the US strongly overruled. The page on Cuba doesn’t include anything about Assata Shakur, nor does it mention Generation Y or the Bay of Pigs. Each part of this understanding became a piece of my reality when I read about it and talked about it, and then advocated it. I began to see points in my life where I acted as the Venezuelan people, or Latin American people, and points in my life when I acted as the US government does. The racial dilemma of being brown means that I feel oppressed in a room of white people and as the oppressor in a room of black people. As a woman of color, I feel like a direct embodiment of resistance. My social location in terms of debate had more to do with my metaphorical class, based upon the number of ballots I had won. Even when my last partner and I were winning debates; it seemed as if I was invisible because the wins weren’t actually mine. In debate, I wish for us all to strive to act as Venezuelans have, and to recognize this resistance in ourselves, because respect keeps things real. Respect for education, for people, for experiences.**

**Current foreign policy strategies are constructed to exclude voice. In order to include subjugated knowledge, we must forget traditional strategies.**

**KRISHNA** Dept of Political Science @ University of Hawaii @ Manoa **2k1** Sankaran-; *Race, Amnesia, and the Education of International Relations*; ALTERNATIVES 26; p. 401-24 <http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_hb3225/is_4_26/ai_n28886581/>

 Before turning to the three contrapuntal readings of encounters that have consolidated the modern underpinnings of IR discourse through abstraction, I outline what I mean by "strategies of containment." This section is critical to understanding the very nature of contemporary IR discourse, its characteristic anxieties and obsessions, and the reasons why it is a quintessentially "white" discipline constructed around an amnesia on the question of race. IR discourse's valorization and fetishization of "theory" becomes more comprehensible as a "strategy of containment," to use Fredric Jameson's term from his The Political Unconscious. (10) For Jameson, a strategy of containment allows the wielders of a body of interpretive work to "project the illusion that their readings are somehow complete and self-sufficient" (p. 10). With a sharper political edge, he further defines strategies of containment as a process that "allows what can be thought to seem internally coherent in its own terms, while repressing the unthinkable . . . which lies beyond its boundaries" (p. 53). Or, clearer still, a strategy of containment is a means at once of denying those intolerable contradictions that lie hidden beneath the social surface, as intolerable as that Necessity that gives rise to relations of domination in human society, and of constructing on the very ground cleared by such denial a substitute truth that renders existence at least partly bearable. (11) In Jameson's "strategy of containment," one can discern clear echoes of Heidegger's idea of knowledge as the simultaneous act of disclosure/concealment. Founded as it is on discourses that justified, abstracted, and rationalized the genocide of the populations of the so-called new world, the enslavement of Africans, and colonization of the Asians, the discipline of IR is one giant strategy of containment, "a substitute truth that renders existence at least partly bearable." It is also then a quintessentially white discipline. It is not that race disappears from IR; it is rather that race serves as the crucial epistemic silence around which the discipline is written and coheres. That which is made to appear in IR discourse is that which conceals the silent presence of race. Incidentally, from such a view, postcolonial IR is an oxymoron--a contradiction in terms. To decolonize IR is to deschool oneself from the discipline in its current dominant manifestations: to remember international relations, one needs to forget IR. The disciplining moves within the pedagogy of IR--the taboo against overly historical and descriptive narratives; the fetish for quantitative analyses that compress centuries of contested historical narratives into eviscerated numbers; the reduction of socially sentient human beings into rational utility-maximizers; the preference for problem-solving theory (in the guise of policy relevance) rather than for critical or genealogical theory; the putative anarchy of the system of nation-states that discredits possibilities of imagining non-national ways of being; the hypermasculine tetchiness and insecurity on questions of gender, androgyny, and queer identity; and, most significantly, the elision of themes such as the theft of land, racism, slavery, and colonialism can be collectively understood as a series of extraordinarily effective moves that preserve the ideology of IR discourse. Pressing on with Jameson, he makes a point of some significance for IR discourse when he notes that "strategies of containment are not only modes of exclusion; they can also take the form of repression in some stricter Hegelian sense of the persistence of the older repressed content beneath the later formalized surface." (12) I argue peremptorily here and now that the obsessive anxiety displayed by IR discourse on issues such as terrorism, third-world immigration, spread of infectious diseases such as AIDS or the Ebola virus, illegal drugs, or refugees, is the return of the repressed. The ideology of IR discourse, its gothic apparitions, premised as they are on an originary alienation and estrangement between a "civilized" West and a dangerous, incomprehensible, and barbaric "rest," is unable to repress the entailments of that alienation through its multiple strategies of containment--they resurface as IR gothic, perhaps the dominant literary genre in the discipline. They return to haunt the habitus of a discipline destined never to be at peace with itself because its origins and reproduction owes to a process of abstraction that represses the violent preconditions of its very locus of enunciation.(13) I am consequently arguing that the very foundations of IR discourse should be interpreted as an attempt at overcoming an originary alienation that clefts humanity with the discovery of the Americas by Columbus in 1492 and the slavery that accelerates thereafter. The encounter with the "other" constituted both the self of Europe from this point in time and space and the steady estrangement of the world thereafter into an enclosed zone that reserved for itself the attributes of civilization, culture, religiosity, science, rationality, private property, and humanity, and attributed to the other the precise opposites--barbarity, a lack of history, superstition, lack of private property, and inferiority. It is perhaps unsurprising that this originary alienation, an alienation that goes to the very heart of the modern condition, is sought to be energetically overcome by the creation and sustenance of a discipline that exemplifies the alienation, and through its devices of abstraction seeks both expiation and transcendence. To understand international relations, then, seek out that which IR discourse represses, hides, elides, conceals, and prematurely closes off as avenues for inquiry. As Toni Morrison has it on the impact of this originary alienation on the content of modernity: Modern life begins with slavery. ... Slavery broke the world in half, it broke it in every way. It broke Europe. It made them into something else, it made them slave masters, it made them crazy. You can't do that for hundreds of years and it not take a toll. They had to dehumanize, not just the slaves but themselves. They had to reconstruct everything in order to make that system appear true. It made everything in world war two possible. It made world war one necessary. Racism is the word we use to encompass all this. (14)

# Contention 2 – Our Method

**Voice needs to develop value in order for us to question dominant structures. Neoliberalism within international policies spills into our interpersonal relationships and results in contaminated social cooperation. Debate is personal, and discussion of personal experiences is a good thing. Voice as a process requires us to actually respect other expressions as narratives, and to give them the same weight that we give our own.**

Couldry, 2010 [Nick, Professor of Media and Communications at Goldsmiths University of London, “Why Voice Matters: Culture and Politics After Neoliberalism”, LW]

This reflexive concern with the conditions for voice as a process, including those that involve its devaluing, means that 'voice', as used here, is a value about values or what philosophers sometimes call a 'second order' value.¶ Why should this distinction be important? What can the term 'voice', used in this special way, add to other terms, such as democracy or justice, in helping us think about political change? The reason lies in a historically specific situation. A particular discourse, neoliberalism, has come to dominate the contemporary world (formally, practically, culturally and imaginatively). That discourse operates with a view of economic life that does not value voice and imposes that view of economic Life on to politics, via a reductive view of politics as the implementing of market functioning. In the process of imposing itself on politics and society, neoliberal discourse evacuates entirely the place of the social in politics and politics' regulation of economics. These moves have been implemented in various ways in different countries, whether or not they are formal democracies and to greater or lesser degrees using the disguise of democracy. The result is the crisis of voice under neoliberalism. I offer 'voice' here as a connecting term that interrupts neoliberalism's view of economics and economic life, challenges neoliberalism's claim that its view of politics as market functioning trumps all others, enables us to build an alternative view of politics that is at least partly oriented to valuing processes of voice, and includes within that view of politics a recognition of people's capacities for social cooperation based on voice, I use one word - voice - to capture both the value that can enable these connections and the process which is that value's key reference-point. The term 'voice', as used here, does not derive from a particular view of economic processes (consumer 'voice') or even mechanisms of political representation (political 'voice'), but from a broader account of how human beings are. The value of voice articulates some basic aspects of human life that are relevant whatever our views on democracy or justice, so establishing common ground between contemporary frameworks for evaluating economic, social and political organization (for example, the varied work of philosophers Paul Ricoeur and Judith Butler, development economist Amartya Sen, social theorist Axel Honneth and political theorist Nancy Fraser); and it links our account of today's crisis of voice to a variety of sociological analyses (from diagnoses of the contemporary workplace to accounts of particular groups' long-term exclusion from effective voice). All are resources for addressing the contemporary crisis of voice and thinking beyond the neoliberal framework that did so much to cause it.

**Our 4 tier process, of academic and organic intellectuals, personal narratives, and subjugated knowledges, is necessary for good, balanced knowledge production – analysis which excludes any of these invalidates the entire process**

**Motta, 2013** [Sara C, senior lecturer in politics at the University of Newcastle, NSW, Australia, “Reinventing the Lefts in Latin America: Critical Perspectives from Below”, Latin American Perspectives, [http://lap.sagepub.com/content/40/4/5.full.pdf+html](http://lap.sagepub.com/content/40/4/5.full.pdf%2Bhtml), BJM]

As Mendieta (2008: xii) argues, the ideological prophets and political architects of neoliberalism sought to create an age of “the abolition of politics.” This “antipolitics” was primarily an effort to disarticulate, delegitimize, and criminalize popular-class political horizons and imaginaries, projects, subjectivities, moral economies,1 and ways of life. The embodied and visceral rupture of the Caracazo signaled the emergence of cracks in neoliberal elites’ ability to speak for Latin America’s popular classes. The fault lines in this project of antipolitics deepened in the following decade and eventually resulted in the election to power of various governments falling under the broad rubric of the “pink tide,” including those of Luiz Ignácio (Lula) da Silva of the Workers’ Party in Brazil, Hugo Chávez in Venezuela, and Evo Morales in Bolivia, and the development of social-movement and community struggles—the recovered-factories movement in Argentina, the Movimento Sem Terra (Landless Rural Workers’ Movement—MST) in Brazil, the water movements in Uruguay, the indigenous movements in Ecuador and Bolivia, the urban land committees in Venezuela, and women’s community work in Mexico, to name but a few. Our intention in this issue is to open the way for the exploration of the reinvention of Latin American lefts that this tide represents. Specifically, its focus is on the way in which this reinvention is being developed from below, the challenges it presents to twentieth-century political categories and conceptualizations of left alternatives, and the possibilities and contradictions of these new forms of popular politics. This focus was chosen because, as Ana Ceceña (2012: 118) points out, “places of dislocation and epistemological invention . . . are created on a daily basis. It is from such spaces that the new world springs.” Transgressing traditional left conceptualizations of popular political subjectivities and the nature of political and social change, the reinvention of Latin American lefts from below presents a challenge to the dominant androcentric social-cultural matrix of the twentieth-century left, in which organized labor was often viewed as the key agent of popular struggle and the state as the key political tool of social transformation. This was combined with particular forms of political organization—the party and the union, for example—and expressed in a laborist moral economy and political culture in which the key site of political struggle was often the workplace as opposed to the home or the community (see Leiva, 2012, for an analysis of this in the case of the Chilean labor movement). According to Enrique Dussel (2008: xvi), these new movements and events “represent signs of hope, in the face of which we must begin to create a new theory. This new theory cannot merely respond to the presuppositions of the last five hundred years of capitalist and colonialist modernity; it cannot set out from bourgeois postulates or from those of real ‘socialism.’” Rather, it must first, as Ceceña (2012: 118) explains, develop knowledge for and by those excluded from and on the margins of political power and theory production. Second, it must speak from the placed body or the particular (Gutiérrez, 2012: 61) and thus from the experience of oppression. Third, it must foster the emergence of subjects historically rejected and ignored by capitalist colonial modernity (Mignolo, 2009). In Ceceña’s words, “Speaking about and from these knowledges involves putting them, from the beginning, on a different plane from the practices of power that have condemned popular learning. . . . It is necessary to dislocate the planes, moving from a Euclidean plane to another (or to others) with multiple perspectives that break up and expand the dimensions of understanding, opening them to the penetration of other cosmologies.” This new theory is not created by positing a dichotomous history of popular struggle that undercuts the role of history and popular traditions or ignores the repertoires of protest and political institutions characteristic of previous left struggles. Rather, it aims to make visible the historical and current micropolitics from which new popular political subjectivities and practices emerge. Many of the analyses in this issue focus on histories of struggle influenced by, for example, liberation theology, popular education, struggles over land, housing, and habitat, and the left traditions of the twentieth century. Today’s reinvention occurs in dialogue with these traditions. The development of new concepts and theories is embedded in a commitment to a politics of knowledge that begins from the ground up and builds from the realities of popular politics in community struggles, movement organizing, and everyday life. The contributors to this issue approach the task of analyzing the reinvention of lefts from below through fine-grained empirical analysis, ethnography, and participant and activist scholarship that builds upon the practical-theoretical contributions of the movements themselves. They foreground the multiplicity that is at the heart of this reinvention and the necessity to speak and theorize in the plural. In speaking with, through, and about new forms of popular politics they suggest—sometimes implicitly, sometimes explicitly—that what is being experienced and built in Latin America is not a model that can be transported from one place to another but emerges from concrete places, bodies, traditions, cosmologies, spatialities of power,2 forms of capital and the state, and histories of struggle. **The urgency of comparative engagement with the reinvention of the lefts from below is not only empirical and political but historiographical and ethical**. As many of the contributors to this issue argue, the communities, subjects, and movements that are the lifeblood of this reinvention are commonly “spoken over” by discourses that misname and misrepresent their struggles. These misrepresentations are enacted not only through bourgeois accounts but also through the conceptual framings of much twentieth-century-left-inspired thought and practice. As Diniz and Gilbert (in this issue) show, such discourse colored the MST’s initial development, in which the leadership criticized the camponeses for “an isolationist attitude with respect to union organizing” that was “structurally incompatible . . . with the development of character and social participation.” This was a misreading of camponês culture in that it missed the complex interplay of tradition, culture, and meaning in the sociabilities, moral economies, and forms of anticapitalist labor relations that developed in MST settlements. As I note in my article on the feminization of resistance in Venezuelan shantytowns, the private has often been ignored as a site of value production, and thus community-based struggles over social reproduction such as access to health care, education, and housing have largely been viewed as secondary in revolutionary change. Traditional conceptual and political categories blind us to the complexities and intricacies of the popular political processes being developed. The contributors therefore suggest the need to stretch our understanding of the content, form, and nature of left politics and political subjectivities. Foregrounded in many of the contributions **is commitment to a methodology that begins from the specificity of the place of the community and movement experience**, such as the participatory qualitative research of Diniz and Gilbert with the MST. This approach enables engagement with the lived realities and complexities of the everyday construction of social relationships, sociabilities, strategies, solidarities, and practices. Importantly, none of the contributors suggest that this means confining the analysis or the development of political categories to a reified localism, which can result in a liberal relative pluralism and/or a fragmentation and conservative articulation of popular politics (Harvey, 1997; Wainwright, 1994). Instead, they suggest other methodological pathways. One of them is activist participatory and ethnographic research in which the researcher develops relationships of solidarity and trust with the movement. This enables the co-construction of research questions, design, implementation, and analysis to produce knowledge that is relevant to both movement strategic and political concerns and broader political/ theoretical debates. This approach draws on the work of activist scholars such as Bevington and Dixon (2005), Chatterton (2008), Mohanty (2003), and Wainwright (1994). A second approach is border thinking, which privileges the margins, the oppressed, and the excluded. It conceptualizes research practice as enabling the creation of connections between movements in order to foster reflection on practice and strategic development. It enacts a research ethics committed to revealing the practices, knowledge, ways of life, and philosophies of those otherwise excluded and marginalized from theory production and political power (see Motta, 2012, for an example of border thinking and Ceceña, 2012, for an analysis of the relationship between emancipatory struggles and the politics of knowledge). In both of these approaches there is a clear politics and ethics of knowledge that politicizes not only the content but the process of knowledge production— that builds upon communities’ lived realities and embodied experiences of oppression to develop theories and strategies capable of transforming those conditions. These approaches politicize the traditional division of labor between the thinker/analyst/knower and the known and replace it with methodologies and pedagogies that reflect the democratic and participatory practices that many of these movements are forging (see, e.g., Chukaitis, 2009; Colectivo Situaciones, 2003; Mignolo, 2009; Motta, 2011a). The contributors to the issue have engaged with the task of theorizing the reinvention of Latin American lefts from below in a number of ways. Some have developed hybrid critical political economy frameworks that involve conversations between Marxist thinkers such as Gramsci (1971) and Lefebvre (1991), engaging with Marxist social movement analysis such as that developed by Petras and Veltemeyer (2005) or revitalizing and developing Marxist feminist theory as in the work of Federici (2004). Others have engaged with thinkers from the Latin American subalternist and postcolonial tradition such as Mignolo (2009), creating hybrid conversations between autonomist and more orthodox Marxist accounts. Still others have developed an epistemology arising from the philosophical and theoretical traditions of the movements themselves. **Each theoretical framing enables engagement with different elements of this reinvention**—spatiality and temporality, subjectivity, everyday cultures and religiosity, relationships with the state, the “pink tide” government, and/or the market, and movement cosmologies. What unites the different approaches is neither their foci nor their underlying assumptions about the political but that they come from the margins of the accepted scholarly repertoires of politics. Because of the plurality of their foci and their assumptions, they are able to weave a rich tapestry of insights that reflects the multiplicity and the tensions in the popular political struggles that are being played out across the continent. We hope to contribute to the empirical mapping of the reinvention of Latin American lefts from below and develop theory that will be of use to critical scholars who seek to engage with this reinvention in Latin America and beyond.

**Our role as academics is to provide a political intervention to cultivate informed public through critical engagement---that’s necessary to realize the revolutionary potential of radical democracy**

Giroux 13 [Henry A. currently holds the Global TV Network Chair Professorship at McMaster University in the English and Cultural Studies Department and a Distinguished Visiting Professorship at Ryerson University. His most recent books include: On Critical Pedagogy (Continuum, 2011), Twilight of the Social: Resurgent Publics in the Age of Disposability (Paradigm 2012), Disposable Youth: Racialized Memories and the Culture of Cruelty (Routledge 2012), Youth in Revolt: Reclaiming a Democratic Future (Paradigm 2013), and The Educational Deficit and the War on Youth (Monthly Review Press, 2013), America's Disimagination Machine (City Lights) and Higher Education After Neoliberalism (Haymarket) will be published in 2014). Giroux is also a member of Truthout's Board of Directors. “Intellectuals as Subjects and Objects of Violence,” 9-10-13, <http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/18704-intellectuals-as-subjects-and-objects-of-violence>, BJM

Intellectuals should provide a model for connecting scholarship and public life, address important social and political issues, speak to multiple audiences, help citizens come to a more critical and truthful understanding of their own views and their relations to others and the larger society. But they should do more than simply raise important questions, they should also work to create those public spheres and formative cultures in which matters of dialogue, thoughtfulness and critical exchange are both valued and proliferate//. Zygmunt Bauman is right in arguing that it is the moral necessity and obligation of the intellectual to take responsibility for their responsibility - for ourselves, others and the larger world. Part of that responsibility entails becoming a moral witness, expanding the political imagination, and working with social movements in their efforts to advance social and economic justice, promote policies that are just, and make meaningful the promises of a radical democracy. //What might it mean for intellectuals to assume such a role, even if in limited spheres such as public and higher education? At the very least, it would suggest educating students as informed and critical citizens by providing them with a language that will extend their sense of individual and social agency, deepen and enlarge their intellectual perspectives, and broaden their ability to think critically and engage with wider audiences. Instead, we educate them to be either low-paid workers who despise the social wage or to become a potential workforce for the Walmart-prison-industrial complex. College campuses, once a hotbed of dissent, have become prime sites in developing weapons of death. Faculty has largely been reduced to adjuncts - out of 1.5 million faculty, more than 1 million hold temporary jobs. Learning is being turned into a form of commerce or training. Critical thought is now viewed as an excess in a culture in which a college education is simply a credential for getting a well-paid job. At best, students are now trained or groomed to be ardent, unquestioning consumers - the children of Aldous Huxley's nightmares - who eventually define their intense investment in pleasure through forms of violence that provide increasingly the only thrill left in a society dominated by surveillance cameras, Reality TV, the culture of cruelty, and the mind-numbing experience of the ever-present shopping malls. Against the onslaught of anti-public intellectuals, there is a more laudable role that intellectuals can develop such as working with other intellectuals and community groups in a variety of sites to address those important social, political and economic issues that are now destroying all vestiges of the public good and democracy - issues ranging from poverty, war, militarization, the war on women, the privatization and commodification of education, and the full-fledged corporate destruction of the environment. Though the conditions supporting such practices are diminishing in American society, such public concerns and political interventions, which are largely educational in nature, are particularly crucial issues for those young people, educators and engaged citizens who are struggling to make education a central feature of politics. Instead of holding up billionaires such as Bill Gates, former trader and hedge-fund manager Nassim Nicholas Taleb, and celebrities such as Irish rocker Bono as public intellectuals, there is a need for this generation of youth to be exposed to public intellectuals who are working actively to develop those formative cultures in which social, cultural and economic conditions can be put in places that provide opportunities for young people to learn how to be engaged, socially responsible and critical agents.