## Advantage 1 is the Bolivarian Movement

#### In the 1970s, neoliberalism took root in rich countries as a policy framework which responded to the global economic crisis. A decade later, it manifested itself as economic conditions on multilateral finance imposed around the world, but specifically in Latin America, known as the “Washington Consensus”.

Couldry 10 (7/14/2010, Nick, Professor of Media and Communications at Goldsmiths University of London, “Why Voice Matters: Culture and Politics After Neoliberalism,” LW)

What type of object do we understand neoliberalism to be? The economic policies with which neoliberalism is associated are well known and are easily listed, for example in the form of the orthodoxy which emerged as the conditions imposed in Latin America and elsewhere in return for multilateral finance in the 1980s and 1990s. These came to be known in economist John Williamson's phrase as 'the Washington consensus': strong fiscal discipline, reductions in public expenditure, tax reform to encourage market investors, interest rates determined by markets and not the state, competitive exchange rates, trade liberalization, the encouragement of foreign direct investment, privatization of public services and assets, deregulation of financial and other markets, and the securing of private property rights." But neoliberalism has also been a policy framework adopted voluntarily by many rich countries such as the USA and the UK. Neoliberalism, then, is not just the Washington Consensus but more broadly the range of policies that evolved internationally from the early 1980s to make market functioning (and the openness of national economies to global market forces) the overwhelming priority for social organization. Neoliberalism did not start as a theory about politics, but as a new economic 'policy regime' in Richard Peet's phrase," Neoliberalism took root as the rationale behind a particular interpretation of the 1970s global economic crisis and policy responses to it. By reading that crisis as the result of the failure of a preceding economic policy regime (Keynesianism), neoliberalism authorized a quite different approach to politics and economics which saw market competition as their common practical and normative reference-point, with state intervention in the economy now the aberration."¶ The elites and adviser circles involved in developing this new 'rationality' of economic and political management were more than technical consultants; they were, in Peel's words, 'centres of the creation of meaning'. 10

#### There is a war going on all around us, between the exporters of capitalism and those oppressed by it. Central and South America are plagued with economic inequality, child labor, drugs, crime, and violence. Many people in these countries don’t even have running water, plumbing, education or healthcare. The Bolivarian Movement is the eye of the storm, the center of the resistance movement, because it has served as a democratic state with an alternative to neoliberalism. Other countries are beginning to model the movement’s anti-neoliberal stance.

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

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. Chavez’ political movement would become more and more revolutionary in response. The class conflict had become clearer than ever. Chavez 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 Chavez’ 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.

#### Our human drive for domination has led to the evolution of the neoliberal system which threatens the survival of all kinds of life. Neoliberalism is a symptom of the greater human drive for exploitation which has manifested in modernization and industrialization. Economic development is a ruse that serves to hide the patriarchy and marginalization of beings inherent in the United States’ economic policies.

Nhanenge 7 (Jytte Masters @ U South Africa, paper submitted in part fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of master of arts in the subject Development Studies, “ECOFEMINSM: TOWARDS INTEGRATING THE CONCERNS OF WOMEN, POOR PEOPLE AND NATURE INTO DEVELOPMENT)

There is today an increasing critique of economic development, whether it takes place in the North or in the South. Although the world on average generates more and more wealth, the riches do not appear to "trickle down" to the poor and improve their material well-being. Instead, poverty and economic inequality is growing. Despite the existence of development aid for more than half a century, the Third World seems not to be "catching up" with the First World. Instead, militarism, dictatorship and human repression is multiplied. Since the mid 1970s, the critique of global economic activities has intensified due to the escalating deterioration of the natural environment. Modernization, industrialisation and its economic activities have been directly linked to increased scarcity of natural resources and generation of pollution, which increases global temperatures and degrades soils, lands, water, forests and air. The latter threat is of great significance, because without a healthy environment human beings and animals will not be able to survive. Most people believed that modernization of the world would improve material well-being for all. However, faced with its negative side effects and the real threat of extinction, one must conclude that somewhere along the way "progress" went astray. Instead of material plenty, economic development generated a violent, unhealthy and unequal world. It is a world where a small minority live in material luxury, while millions of people live in misery. These poor people are marginalized by the global economic system. They are forced to survive from degraded environments; they live without personal or social security; they live in abject poverty, with hunger, malnutrition and sickness; and they have no possibility to speak up for themselves and demand a fair share of the world's resources. The majority of these people are women, children, traditional peoples, tribal peoples, people of colour and materially poor people (called women and Others). They are, together with nature, dominated by the global system of economic development imposed by the North. It is this scenario, which is the subject of the dissertation. The overall aim is consequently to discuss the unjustified domination of women, Others and nature and to show how the domination of women and Others is interconnected with the domination of nature. A good place to start a discussion about domination of women, Others and nature is to disclose how they disproportionately must carry the negative effects from global economic development. The below discussion is therefore meant to give an idea of the "flip-side" of modernization. It gives a gloomy picture of what "progress" and its focus on economic growth has meant for women, poor people and the natural environment. The various complex and inter-connected, negative impacts have been ordered into four crises. The categorization is inspired by Paul Ekins and his 1992 book "A new world order; grassroots movements for global change". In it, Ekins argues that humanity is faced with four interlocked crises of unprecedented magnitude. These crises have the potential to destroy whole ecosystems and to extinct the human race. The first crisis is the spread of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, together with the high level of military spending. The second crisis is the increasing number of people afflicted with hunger and poverty. The third crisis is the environmental degradation. Pollution, destruction of ecosystems and extinction of species are increasing at such a rate that the biosphere is under threat. The fourth crisis is repressionand denial of fundamental human rights by governments, which prevents people from developing their potential. It is highly likely that one may add more crises to these four, or categorize them differently, however, Ekins's division is suitable for the present purpose. (Ekins 1992: 1).

#### Neoliberal discourse doesn’t value voice, and imposes this disregard for voice onto politics, by interpreting politics as an implementation of how the market functions.

Couldry 10 (7/14/2010, 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.

#### Voice as a process, rather than a focus on content, is necessary to provide self-interpretation and autonomy. To deny potential for voice is to deny a basic aspect of human life. Voice as a value is a neoliberal concept to control voice in market systems.

Couldry 10 (7/14/2010, Nick, Professor of Media and Communications at Goldsmiths University of London, “Why Voice Matters: Culture and Politics After Neoliberalism,” LW)

Let me now run through some principles which capture what is distinctive about voice as a process. Some details of this approach will have to be deferred until Chapter Five, but I will try to explain enough to help us grasp why such a process might be worth valuing.¶ By voice as a process, I shall mean, as already suggested, the process of giving an account of one's life and its conditions: what philosopher Judith Butler calls 'giving an account of oneself"." To give such an account means telling a story, providing a narrative. It is not often, perhaps, that any of us sits down to tell a story with a formal beginning and end. But at another more general level, narrative is a basic feature of human action: 'a narrative history of a certain kind turns out to be a basic and essential genre for the characterization of human actions'. This is because, as Charles Taylor put it, man is 'a self-interpreting animal'.26 What we do - beyond a basic description of how our limbs move in space - already comes embedded in narrative, our own and that of others. This is why to deny value to another's capacity for narrative - to deny her potential for voice - is to deny a basic dimension of human life. A form of life that systematically denied voice would not only be intolerable, it would, as Paul Ricoeur noted in the quote at the start of this chapter, barely be a culture at all. Recognizing this is common to a wide range of philosophy from the Anglo-American tradition (Alisdair Macintyre, Charles Taylor) to the continental tradition (Paul Ricoeur) to post-structuralism (Judith Butler, Adriana Cavarero). The aspect of voice which matters most then for voice as a value is people's practice of giving an account, implicitly or explicitly, of the world within which they act. It is worth noting that this approach to voice is some way from the more abstract formulation given by Albert Hirschman in his pioneering early work in economics, which defined voice as 'any attempt at all to change, rather than escape from, an objectionable state of affairs'," This abstracts somewhat from the content that is distinctive of voice - the practice of giving an account - concentrating instead on the effects of voice's exercise in market systems. If, by contrast, we define voice at one level as the capacity to make, and be recognized as making narratives about one's life, some further general principles follow. [We do not advocate gendered language].

#### Voice is the only way to challenge the neoliberal claim that viewing market functioning as a primary concern, and it allows us to build alternatives to neoliberalism.

Couldry 10 (7/14/2010, Nick, Professor of Media and Communications at Goldsmiths University of London, “Why Voice Matters: Culture and Politics After Neoliberalism,” LW)

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.

#### Critical pedagogy opens a forum to develop skills to question relationships, critically analyze, and to draw logical conclusions, and then to use these abilities to create social change. History is used as a point of dialogue rather than a factual text. We recognize our position of privilege through this critical analysis.

Giroux 11 (Chair of English and Cultural Studies at McMaster University, “Rejecting Academic Labor as a Subaltern Class: Learning from Paula Freire and the Politics of Critical Pedagogy”, http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/8\_2/Giroux8\_2.html, DL)

Freire was acutely aware that what makes critical pedagogy so dangerous to ideological fundamentalists, the ruling elites, religious extremists, and right-wing nationalists all over the world is that central to its very definition is the task of educating students to become critical agents who actively question and negotiate the relationships between theory and practice, critical analysis and common sense, and learning and social change. Critical pedagogy opens up a space where students should be able to come to terms with their own power as critically engaged citizens; it provides a sphere where the unconditional freedom to question and assert is made central to the purpose higher education, if not democracy itself. And as a political and moral practice, way of knowing, and literate engagement, critical pedagogy attempts to “make evident the multiplicity and complexity of history.”[[9](http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/8_2/Giroux8_2.html#note9)] History in this sense is engaged as a narrative open to critical dialogue rather than predefined text to be memorized and accepted unquestioningly. Pedagogy in this instance provides the conditions to cultivate in students a healthy skepticism about power, a “willingness to temper any reverence for authority with a sense of critical awareness.”[[10](http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/8_2/Giroux8_2.html#note10)] As a performative practice, pedagogy takes as one of its goals the opportunity for students to be able to reflectively frame their own relationship to the ongoing project of an unfinished democracy. It is precisely this relationship between democracy and pedagogy that is so threatening to so many of our educational leaders and spokespersons today, and it is also the reason why Freire’s work on critical pedagogy and literacy is more relevant today than when it was first published. Clearly, such a pedagogy demands not just a critical understanding of the relations between knowledge and power, learning and experience, and education and social change, but also a willingness to fight for the labor conditions that both promote academic freedom and struggle against academic repression. At the heart of any vestige of critical pedagogy is both the project of relating education to the creation of informed citizens and the labor conditions that give faculty the opportunity to engage in the pedagogies that make such a project possible. This is not merely a dispute over who should control the classroom, but a struggle over how power is shared, used, and institutionalized so as to create the structural and ideological conditions for experiencing the university as a democratic public sphere.¶ According to Freire, all forms of pedagogy represent a particular way of understanding society and a specific commitment to the future. Critical pedagogy, unlike dominant modes of teaching, insists that one of the fundamental tasks of educators is to make sure that the future points the way to a more socially just world, a world in which the discourses of critique and possibility in conjunction with the values of reason, freedom, and equality function to alter, as part of a broader democratic project, the grounds upon which life is lived. Such a future cannot be built on the backs of a subaltern class of academics who are powerless, overworked, denied basic benefits, and removed from shaping policy. Nor is the problem solved by simply calling for a limit to the pool of potential faculty. This is a political issue that is about power, the meaning of education, and what role faculty, students, and administrators are going to play in shaping a future much different than the present. This is hardly a prescription for political indoctrination in the classroom; rather, it is a project that gives critical education its most valued purpose and meaning, which is “to encourage human agency, not mold it in the manner of Pygmalion.”[[11](http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/8_2/Giroux8_2.html#note11)] It is a position that also threatens right-wing private advocacy groups, neoconservative politicians, and conservative extremists. Such individuals and groups are keenly aware that critical pedagogy with its emphasis on the hard work of critical analysis, moral judgments, and social responsibility goes to the very heart of what it means to address real inequalities of power among faculty and administrators, or among others across society, and to conceive of education as a project for freedom while at the same time foregrounding a series of important and often ignored questions such as: What is the role of teachers and academics as public intellectuals? Whose interests does public and higher education serve? How might it be possible to understand and engage the diverse contexts in which education takes place? What is the role of education as a public good? How do we make knowledge meaningful in order to make it critical and transformative? How do we democratize governance? Against the right-wing view that equates any suggestion of politics with indoctrination, critical pedagogy is concerned with offering students new ways to think critically and act with authority as independent political agents in the classroom and in larger society; in other words, it is concerned with providing students with the skills and knowledge necessary for them to expand their capacities first to question the deep-seated assumptions and myths that legitimate the archaic and disempowering social practices structuring every aspect of society and then to take responsibility for intervening in the world they inhabit.¶ Education cannot be neutral. It is always directive in its attempt to teach students to inhabit a particular mode of agency, enable them to understand the larger world and one’s role in it in a specific way, define their relationship, if not responsibility, to diverse others, and experience in the classroom some sort of understanding of a more just, imaginative, and democratic life. Pedagogy is by definition directive, but that does not mean it is merely a form of indoctrination. On the contrary, as Freire argued, education as a practice for freedom must expand the capacities necessary for human agency, and hence the possibilities for how academic labor should be configured to ensure such a project that is integral to democracy itself. Surely, this suggests that even within the privileged precincts of higher education, educators should nourish those pedagogical practices that promote “a concern with keeping the forever unexhausted and unfulfilled human potential open, fighting back all attempts to foreclose and pre-empt the further unravelling of human possibilities, prodding human society to go on questioning itself and preventing that questioning from ever stalling or being declared finished.”[[12](http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/8_2/Giroux8_2.html#note12)] In other words, critical pedagogy forges an expanded notion of politics and agency through a language of skepticism and possibility, and a culture of openness, debate, and engagement—all those elements now at risk because of the current and most dangerous attacks on higher education. This was Paulo’s legacy, one that invokes dangerous memories and is increasingly absent from any conservative discourse about current educational problems. Unfortunately, it is also absent from much of the discussion on the current status of academic labor.

## Advantage 2 is Our Movement

I feel like this is my first year debating. As if I’m a novice who is still learning what a disad is. For two years, I was a placeholder. A broken tape recorder that was so far gone that it could only repeat short segments at a time. Voice as a process was entirely devoid from my existence in a debate round. My partner told me what to say, and I said it. I was supposed to be the 2A. But my partner didn’t think I was good enough, so I was double 1s. My partner’s most empathetic moment was the one when they asked me why I was even debating. I was told that I should quit, because I lost to a team who was in finals of the TOC and because I couldn’t spit out every trivial subpoint of a senior’s conditionality block. When we walked into a room, judges and the other team didn’t even see me. And when we walked out? My partner left without me. The only time we talked was during my speeches, when I was standing up in front of a judge, completely humiliated. However, I know that I was talked about during late night phone calls and whispered discussions in the hallway. I refuse to call what I did during those 2 years “debating”. Because if that’s what I was doing, maybe my partner was right. Maybe I should quit.

In the same way that the Bolivarian Movement fights neoliberalism and disrespect, Alexis and I engage in a movement to revolutionize the debate space. Otherization is justified by any endorsement of dominant structures. On the international stage, the US otherizes and disrespects individuals in Venezuela. Within debate, the community otherizes anyone who isn’t a traditional debater. Women in debate are pushed into a corner. Debaters who aren’t perceived as good at the activity are laughed at until they quit. Money buys talent, so the students who can’t sustain the prices of tournament registration, travel, and camp, all of which trade off with having a job, are forced out of debate. And anyone who tries to call attention to this doesn’t deserve to have their discussion within the debate community, just as Maduro’s and Chavez’s calls for respect were ignored by the United States. The 1AC begins the discussion by calling attention to the disrespect within debate. Through this, the aff dialogue is a display of voice as a process, which is critical to every movement. The first step to change is acceptance, and that is what the affirmative calls for.

## Advantage 3 is Genealogy

#### Resurrection of subjugated knowledges through an exploration of genealogy is critical to effective movements

Medina 11 (José Medina is a Professor of Philosophy and Director of Graduate Studies at Vanderbilt University. “Foucault Studies”, http://www.vanderbilt.edu/AnS/philosophy/\_people/faculty\_files/\_medinafoucaultstudies.pdf)

The central goal of this paper is to show the emancipatory potential of the epistemological framework underlying Foucault’s work. More specifically, I will try to show that the Foucaultian approach places practices of remembering and for-getting in the context of power relations in such a way that possibilities of resistance and subversion are brought to the fore. When our cultural practices of remembering and forgetting are interrogated as loci where multiple power relations and power struggles converge, the first thing to notice is the heterogeneity of differently situ-ated perspectives and the multiplicity of trajectories that converge in the epistemic negotiations in which memories are formed or de-formed, maintained alive or killed. The discursive practices in which memory and oblivion are manufactured are not uniform and harmonious, but heterogeneous and full of conflicts and tensions. Foucault invites us to pay attention to the past and ongoing epistemic battles among competing power/knowledge frameworks that try to control a given field. Different fields—or domains of discursive interaction—contain particular discursive regimes with their particular ways of producing knowledge. In the battle among power/ knowledge frameworks, some come on top and become dominant while others are displaced and become subjugated. Foucault’s methodology offers a way of exploiting that vibrant plurality of epistemic perspectives which always contains some bodies of experiences and memories that are erased or hidden in the mainstream frame-works that become hegemonic after prevailing in sustained epistemic battles. What Foucault calls subjugated knowledges3 are forms of experiencing and remembering that are pushed to the margins and rendered unqualified and unworthy of epistemic respect by prevailing and hegemonic discourses.Subjugated knowledges remain invisible to mainstream perspectives; they have a precarious subterranean existence that renders them unnoticed by most people and impossible to detect by those whose perspective has already internalized certain epistemic exclusions. And with the invisibility of subjugated knowledges, certain possibilities for resistance and subversion go unnoticed. The critical and emancipa-tory potential of Foucaultian genealogy resides in challenging established practices of remembering and forgetting by excavating subjugated bodies of experiences and memories, bringing to the fore the perspectives that culturally hegemonic practices have foreclosed. The critical task of the scholar and the activist is to resurrect subju-gated knowledges—that is, to revive hidden or forgotten bodies of experiences and memories—and to help produce insurrections of subjugated knowledges.4 In order to be critical and to have transformative effects, genealogical investigations should aim at these insurrections, which are critical interventions that disrupt and interrogate epistemic hegemonies and mainstream perspectives (e.g. official histories, standard interpretations, ossified exclusionary meanings, etc). Such insurrections involve the difficult labor of mobilizing scattered, marginalized publics and of tapping into the critical potential of their dejected experiences and memories. An epistemic insur-rection requires a collaborative relation between genealogical scholars/activists and the subjects whose experiences and memories have been subjugated: those subjects by themselves may not be able to destabilize the epistemic status quo until they are given a voice at the epistemic table (i.e. in the production of knowledge), that is, until room is made for their marginalized perspective to exert resistance, until past epistemic battles are reopened and established frameworks become open to con-testation. On the other hand, the scholars and activists aiming to produce insurrec-tionary interventions could not get their critical activity off the ground if they did not draw on past and ongoing contestations, and the lived experiences and memo-ries of those whose marginalized lives have become the silent scars of forgotten struggles.

#### Female debaters become victims of misogyny

Louise Wilson, 13

[http://glasglowguardian.co.uk/2013/03/04/female-debaters-victims-of-misogyny-at-guu/]

Two female speakers, who had made it to the Final of this year’s GUU Ancients Debate, were reduced to tears after a number of misogynistic comments were yelled out by hecklers in the audience. Marlena Valles, recently named Scotland’s best speaker, and Rebecca Meredith, who is ranked amongst the world’s best speakers, were both booed during their speeches at the annual GUU Ancients Debating Championship. Members of the audience also repeatedly yelled “shame women” and objectified the two women based on their appearance. A former President and other prominent members within the Union are amongst those known to have been making the comments. When Pam Cohn and Kitty Parker-Brooks, two of the judges of the competition, openly condemned the sexist comments being made, the two were also attacked. Hecklers were heard to ask what qualifications the women had to allow them to sit on the judging panel. A member of the GUU was subsequently called over in an attempt to stop the sexist heckling, but the member simply replied “it is just how they are” and to “leave it alone”.

#### The aff doesn’t “escape” the state, but rather turns knowledge against knowledge by engaging in a discussion of histories which run counter to the hegemonic model of truth

Medina 11 (José Medina is a Professor of Philosophy and Director of Graduate Studies at Vanderbilt University. “Foucault Studies”, http://www.vanderbilt.edu/AnS/philosophy/\_people/faculty\_files/\_medinafoucaultstudies.pdf)

How do we fight against power on this view? Not by trying to escape it (as if liberation consisted in standing outside power altogether), but rather, by turning power(s) against itself(themselves), or by mobilizing some forms of power against others. Similarly, how do we fight against established and official forms of know-ledge when they are oppressive? Not by trying to escape knowledge altogether, but rather, by turning knowledge(s) against itself(themselves), or by mobilizing some forms of knowledge against others. The critical battle against the monopolization of knowledge-producing practices involves what Foucault calls ‚an insurrection of subjugated knowledges.‛ When it comes to knowledge of the past and the power associated with it, this battle involves resisting the ‚omissions‛ and distortions of of-ficial histories, returning to lost voices and forgotten experiences, relating to the past from the perspective of the present in an alternative (out-of-the-mainstream) way. And this is precisely what the Foucaultian notions of ‚counter-history‛ and ‚coun-ter-memory‛ offer.